THE CHRISTIAN VINDICATION OF PATRIOTISM

THE CHRISTIAN VINDICATION OF PATRIOTISM

THE BAIRD LECTURE FOR 1920

BY

ROBERT STEVENSON, D.D.

MINISTER OF GARGUNNOCK

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MCMXXI

TO

MY WIFE

PREFACE.

WHEN the Baird Trustees did me the honour to ask me to be their Lecturer for 1920, the consideration which chiefly constrained me to accede to the request in the face of much misgiving was the instant presentment to my mind of a subject I should like to treat. Such an immediate view of a topic, while it includes no necessary guarantee of competence to deal with it, may be held to add confirmation to a call otherwise received.

Now that the subject has been brought down from the vagueness of a conception to the treatment of the following pages, I am inevitably conscious of the inadequacy of my presentation of it; but I am more persuaded than ever of the critical importance of the theme itself, and of the timeliness of some discussion of it in our age. In a period when the most conspicuous feature of world-politics is the almost universal uprising of the "nationalist" spirit, the question as to how

far this spirit is congruous with religious ideals and can be baptised into Christian service seems to me one of the most important with which Christian ethics can be called to deal.

I have made my reading on the topic as wide as limited time and opportunity have allowed, and have tried to add authority and brightness to my pages by free use in quotation of the fruits of this reading. It is a pleasure to name one book in particular as a principal creditor: 'The History of English Patriotism' (2 vols.), by Esmé Wingfield Stratford. Without the facts and references supplied by Mr Stratford the sixth chapter of this book could not have been projected.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor G. S. Duncan, O.B.E., of St Andrews, for assistance in reading the proofs and for many helpful suggestions; also to my former neighbour, Mr Alexander Miller, Inspector of Taxes, Inverness, for very kindly preparing the Index. The Rev. W. H. Rankine of Kirkmichael had read most of the manuscript before his lamented death, and I am glad that the contents had his general approval as well as his friendly criticism.

ROBERT STEVENSON.

GARGUNNOCK, 1921.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY—THE PROBLEM STATED

"On all great subjects much remains to be said."—J. S. Mill.

"Humanity is a man who lives for ever, and who learns continually."—Pascal.

CHAPTER I.

THE subject which it is proposed to study in the following pages is the title of patriotism to rank as a Christian virtue, and a few words may profitably be said at the outset regarding the *why* of the undertaking. The British temperament is healthily antagonistic to needless uncovering of the springs of sentiment, and there may be a half-resentful feeling in the minds of readers that love of country is an instinct so simple and so sacred as to claim exemption from analysis. "What can you find to say at length about patriotism?" said a friend to the writer, when these chapters were in lecture-form; "I always thought that patriotism just meant 'God save the King.'" Such resolute under-statement is a characteristic of our Northern race, and others may agree with the speaker of the words that the matter should be "left at that." Nevertheless the solid importance of the subject is not to be denied, and stands out in specially strong relief against the background of recent events.

If the reader will cast his mind back to the history of the last decade, he will discover that there is a disconcerting tendency on the part of love of country to be dedicated with equal facility to the highest good or the sorest hurt of mankind. Let him, for instance, consider the probable contrast in his own mind between the implications of the word "patriotism," according as he is thinking of Great Britain or of Germany. He will doubtless feel that the achievements of patriotic ardour in his own country have made his heart beat quicker and the blood flow faster through his veins; he can hardly doubt the virtue, or question the validity of an instinct so formative. All the more, it is disquieting to realise that in another country, geographically near, and akin in racial origin, an instinct called by the same name, and presumably of the same kind, has plunged the world into a war which is now generally held to have been as needless as it was destructive, and has led to the costliest sacrifice ever laid on the altar of a false god. Obviously, our suggested subject raises questions that are neither unreal nor unimportant.

The conviction which has prompted the choice of the subject, and has steadily grown stronger in the writer's mind during its study, is that patriotism of a certain quality is one of the most urgent needs of the world in our time. The quality

we are thinking of will emerge as we proceed. It lies in the neighbourhood of obedience to the condition that love of country shall be dedicated to a love higher than itself. Argument will be offered to show that the various objections which have been urged against patriotism on the ground of religious principle are valid only as against perversions of the instinct. While, on the other hand, the power of a noble love of country to raise the individual above self-interest and the community above class-interest, and at the same time to offer to the wider service of mankind an instrument of rare efficiency—this power places patriotism in the forefront of the virtues to be coveted for modern Christendom. Since, however, this contention has itself been vigorously contested, it is necessary to indicate some of the problems which arise when Christianity and patriotism are placed side by side in the field of view.

I.

The broad general fact seems to lie on the surface of life and of experience that there is in every normal human breast a sentiment of love of country, wearing the look of innocence, and presenting itself unabashed at the court of conscience. To no man does it readily occur to think this sentiment wrong ;

it is entwined with gentle memories, and with some of the most sacred of earthly ties; it is rather an instinct than an acquirement. Just as a man does not reason or become explanatory as to why he loves his mother or his brother, but assumes that he cannot do otherwise, so he may find it hard to explain why he loves his mother-country, or feels as a comrade to his brother-citizens, while yet he is conscious of this duty as an intuition. All men know what patriotism is, says Bagehot—as long as they are not asked to tell. "Ithaca," said Odysseus to King Alcinous, "lies low, furthest up the sea-line toward the darkness—a rugged isle, but a good nurse of noble youths; and for myself I can see nought beside sweeter than a man's own country. Verily Calypso would fain have kept me with her in her hollow caves, and likewise too the guileful Circe. But never did they prevail. So surely is there nought sweeter than a man's own country and his parents, even though he dwell far off in a rich home, in a strange land, away from those that begat him." There is hardly a country in the world, however arid and unattractive to the eye of a stranger, that has not proved able to awaken this sentiment in the hearts of those to whom the country belongs. The inhabitants of the island of Crete had a word for patriotism which indicated a mother's love for her children. The Maltese distinguish their little

island by the name of "the flower of the world." Hans Egede tells us that Greenlanders brought to Denmark by a well-intentioned king, bent on their rescue from the rigours of icy mountains, sought with entire absence of gratitude to escape to the dear land of snows. "The catch in the throat came on the word Italia," says a historian, speaking of modern Italy. Even the tiny republic of San Marino looks complacently on the motto of its seal, "In Smallness there is Safety."

Furthermore, it will be at once conceded that this instinct of love of country has been the source of some of the most self-forgetting thoughts, of the most kindling words, and of the most potent loyalties known to history. The exploits of patriotism shine out very bright in the book of golden deeds. We need not go further afield for proof of this statement than to the record of the recent war. It appears in the retrospect as though national life in all lands had been built on a crust covering a lake of liquid fire, whose potency was unsuspected until in burning jets it leaped to the surface. Love of country, deemed by many an emotion meet only for the childhood of the world, turned out to be the reinvigorating passion of its old age. The eye of the latest patriotism was in no wise dim, nor its natural force abated, when from some mount of vision there was beheld the glory or the peril of a land of national inheritance.

To certain observers—let it be clearly noted—this phenomenon was entirely distressing and unwelcome. Many Socialists had prophesied that the world was on the verge of a new stage of progress, wherein the narrower love of the patriot would be superseded by the broader activity of the "international," concerned for the rights of his class, and not for the interests of his nation. So competent an observer as Karl Marx had foretold the near advent of a day when wars would be fought, not between country and country, but between class and class. Labour and capital, he said, were to be the world-wide antagonists; the clefts were to be "horizontal, not vertical." But when the European war broke out, it appeared that, for the moment at least, these notions were erroneous. In the plaintive words of an influential organ of communist opinion: "we had forgotten or ignored the tremendous force of nationality; internationalism went under." Thus, at the centenary of Marx's birth in 1918, the dramatic contrast was unfolded between the views of the prophet and the facts of the hour. He had foretold the horizontal cleavage; and the cleavage was still vertical, and more wide than ever. He had indicated war between classes and unity between nations; and while nations were sundered, the classes within each nation were at one. The assertion of Nationality had brought about the

suspension of class antagonisms. Like Antæus of old, patriotism had seemed near to perish when lifted into the thin air of abstract discussion; but with the shock of war she touched her mother-earth again, and was quickened into new life. Moreover, if the question be asked concerning the European war, which Little Peterkin put to Kaspar—"what good came of it all at last?"—the answer for those who believe in a happier reply than that of Southey must lie in the neighbourhood of principles that are dear to the patriotic heart, such as "the liberty of nations," "national self-determination," "justice to the weak." Thus a first general outlook upon patriotism beholds it as at least a sentiment of notable power, speaking with the accent of authority, and capable of bringing forth fruits of courage, fellowship, and sacrifice in every land.

Yet again, the fact needs no proof that patriotism and religion have often entered into the most intimate alliance. In Scotland least of all is this circumstance likely to be forgotten. Our northern land, which in secular life has shown a singular power of winning the love and securing the active devotion of her children, and also of kindling a beacon-light of liberty for other nations—the land, that is to say, of Wallace and Bruce, of Bannockburn and Flodden Field, of the Highland clan and the Border ballad, of Burns and Scott—is also the

land where patriotism has to a rare extent been informed and energised by religion—the land of Columba and the Culdees, of Knox and Andrew Melville, of the Covenants and the 'Cottar's Saturday Night.' "He is a bravely foolish man," it has been justly said, "who would recite our annals without intimate knowledge of our Church." And the best-equipped of recent Scottish historians has declared that "Scotland has no history apart from the history of the Scottish Church." The Reformation in Scotland was to a large extent a patriotic movement; and since the Reformation, Scotland's chief national institution has been the General Assembly. One does not perhaps think of the Covenanters as lying specially open to the appeal of patriotism on the sentimental side; yet so typical a man of the covenant as Samuel Rutherford wrote to a friend, "I had rather be in Scotland with an angry Jesus Christ than in any Eden or garden in the earth." On a first casual view of the facts, therefore, it might appear that no possible doubt could arise as to the entire congruity of patriotism with religion. Love of God and love of country seem well matched—brethren who may dwell together in unity.

II.

Nevertheless there is undoubtedly another side to the shield, and we are bound in honesty to turn to what seems a debtor's page in patriotism's account with religion. Due weight must be given, to begin with, to the patent fact that some of the most devoted of Christian believers and some of the most consistent of Christian thinkers have held nationalist sentiment suspect, from a sense of loyalty to their faith. So ardent an admirer of the human Jesus as Tolstoi banned patriotism utterly from his list of Christian virtues; so competent a student of history as Lord Acton held it to be a root of all evil; so orthodox a book as 'Paley's Evidences' accepts the statement that patriotism is no part of the Christian character. When, to test this view, we consult the authoritative sources of historic Christianity, the books of the New Testament, we find (as we shall see more fully later) that their teaching is by no means free from apparent ambiguity. Different opinions have been held as to what this teaching is, and not on one side of the debate only have men been ready to contend and suffer. It is undeniable—to mention only a few points at this stage—that

in the direct teaching of Christ and His apostles, little or nothing is said about the deep-grained instinct we tend to find so attractive and so formative; and, on the contrary, a good deal is said which might appear at first sight inconsistent with or destructive of it. Our Lord's bitterest enemies were the men of His own race, and they hated Him precisely because they were of His own race, and resented His apparent detachment from nationalist bonds. "We do not enough realise," says a recent student, "the utterly unpatriotic aspect which the attitude of Christ must have taken in the eyes of His fellow-countrymen." The Cross itself stands out in the Gospel story as the issue and climax of a nationalist demonstration. In the immediately subsequent history of the apostolic Church, we find that our Lord's most influential follower lived in lifelong antagonism to the men of his own blood, and deliberately turned from them to preach in other lands a Gospel without distinction of birth. We observe the first Christian disciples forsaking the closest ties of fatherland, bidden to regard all men as brethren, and instructed that in Christ "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free." We discover, moreover, that the Church of the early centuries was cosmopolitan rather than national in its sympathies; so that, to give only one instance out of

many, Christians did not enlist in the army till the time of Constantine.

In later epochs, we find that certain Christians and certain communities of Christians have persistently tended to frown on patriotism. The more extreme among them have argued like Reginald Pole—traitor to England for the sake of Rome—that love of country is only "engrafted by nature," while love of Church is "given by the Son of God." The more reasonable have echoed the sentiment of Sir Thomas More: "In what country soever we walk in this world, we are but pilgrims and wayfaring men; and if I should take any country for mine own, it must be the Country to which I go, and not the country from which I come." What has Christianity—an inquirer may ask, emboldened by so many allies of the past—to do with patriotism, which, after all, is largely a matter of prejudice and mental inertia, or of custom and education? Is not the Christian bound to value far more highly his fellowship with brother Christians than his connection with even the most illustrious of his own nation if they do not share his faith? Is it a defensible thing, from a religious standpoint, that nations, while filled with jealousy against one another, should claim to be inspired with a common sentiment, so that the very sentiment which is a binding force within the community is a disruptive force as between the com-

munities? And then, suppose that patriotism should provoke to war, as in the past it has often done. Is it not

> "quoer that the Almichty's plan
> Should set oot man to fecht wi' man,
> For the same luve—their native lan'
> And wife and weans?"

When Tertullian was writing in the second century of victory in battle against foreigners, he put some questions which may well be held to wake an echo in the world still: "Is the laurel of triumph made of leaves, or of the dead bodies of men? With ribbons is it adorned, or with graves? Is it bedewed with spices, or the tears of wives and mothers—perhaps, too, of some who are Christians, for even among the barbarians is Christ?"

III.

Such questions as we have indicated evoke an odd medley of discordant reply. On the extreme edge of the debate on one side, we shall observe the zealous patriot, who can conceive no religion higher than love of country, and would cheerfully echo the spirit of the statement made by a high ecclesiastic in a recent French story: "it is impossible to be a good Frenchman without thereby being a good Christian." To him, patriotism is an

innate and innocent instinct, planted in our hearts by the Creator, and given to be a ray of that light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. On the extreme fringe of conviction on the other side, we shall observe the zealous Christian, who in real sorrow of heart has come to suspect patriotism as a chief instrument of evil, and who, in justification of his view, points to the wars it has begotten, the perilous pride it has engendered, and its apparent inconsistency with the Sermon on the Mount. Almost at the moment of writing, a prominent English Nonconformist is reported in the daily press to have used these words: "Patriotism has wrought great things, and produced some magnificent results, but its day is over. It fosters narrowness, bigotry, selfishness, greed, and hatred. Its perils have been exposed by the war, and the Spirit of God is creating a new humanity." To such a man, the elimination of patriotism from the list of Christian virtues would greatly simplify a complex situation, remove at once the most fruitful motive of war, and set the Christian Church free for its proper task—the establishment in the wide world of a kingdom that is of heaven, not of earth. He will probably emphasise the fact that neither Catechism nor Confession speaks of any duty we owe to our country.

It is evident that between the extreme view on one side, that a good Christian can never be a

patriot, to the extreme view on the other side, that a good patriot can never fail to be a Christian, there is room for abundant variety of outlook. Many who are resolved to be in earnest with their Christianity find it hard to make room within it for their patriotism. Some who are in deadly earnest with their patriotism find it hard to persuade it to live on friendly terms with their Christianity, and still harder to bring it into due subordination. Confusion springs up in religious minds. There are questions to be ventilated before they can be deemed to be settled. In a church at Rome, there is an inscription to an English refugee of about 1600 : "Here lies Robert Pecham, an English Catholic, who, after the disruption of England and the Church, quitted his country, unable to endure life there without the Church, and who, coming to Rome, died, unable to endure life here without his country." It may appear to some minds that the world would be well rid of the source of such a troublesome dichotomy.

IV.

It may be profitable at this stage to interject a brief allusion to facts which seem to the writer to make our subject of quite special importance at this precise juncture of history.

In every era of the world's progress there may

be held to be a discoverable "line of advance," predetermined by the Almighty for the onward march of His hosts, and pointed to by the finger of His providence; so that it is a greater thing to gain a yard of movement in that significant direction than to make facile progress to an end less fraught with destiny. Bengel used to say, "*Deus habet horas et moras.*" It were better worth the while of an engineer to achieve a minor improvement in an aeroplane, than a revolutionary reform in a stage-coach; and on the same principle it may be more profitable for Christian thought to gain a gleam of new insight into the particular problem presented to the hour, than to wrestle mightily with outworn or academic issues. There is a "drummer in every age"—to employ another expression of the same idea—whose drum-beats sound on the path of the advancing army, and set the time to which all do wisely to keep step.

Now it may be maintained without extravagance that the specific ethical task whereto God is calling Christendom in this particular era is the discovery and fostering of a noble patriotism—capable on the one hand of stirring into action all that is best in human nature for the good of the land wherein it dwells, and of vitalising the "nationalism" whose awakening in the world is the most conspicuous tendency of our times; and yet capable also, on the other hand, of being purged from

"frantic boast and foolish word," and of being dedicated to the glory of God and the good of mankind. For if such a patriotism be really possible and can be made available among men, Christianity may behold without dismay the various "nationalistic" uprisings which play so large a part in present-day history, and may regard them as only tending to illustrate the saying of Mazzini, that God has written one line of His thought upon each people. And, as part of the same hopeful outlook, Christianity can also wait with patience for the subsidence of the class-strife which is so marked a feature of our time in every Western nation—a strife determined by no natural cleavage, and energised on both sides by mere motives of class-interest. Almost at the moment of writing, an American labour leader has called off a strike which had begun to wear the aspect of incipient civil war. "We are Americans," he has said, "and we cannot fight our country." If patriotism bring about such subdual of a lower motive by a higher, such submergence of a narrow class-interest in a broad generous love of the fatherland, then obviously patriotism is a force to be greatly coveted by every nation which aims at solidarity.

The writer would like in this connection to indicate a line of thought which has led his own mind to an optimistic view of the possible influence of Christian teaching upon the quality of patriotism.

This line of thought finds its starting-point in the reflection that Christianity has already in the past shown itself to possess precisely the authority necessary for the transformation of instincts originally selfish; so that in respect of other instincts to be presently adduced, the same uniform message has been given, the same pathway has been followed, and the same end has been reached. Let the reader consider three key-words—"Individual," "Family," "Clan."

(1) The simplest case is that of the individual. With regard to the individual, Christian men have now become thoroughly familiar with the significance of the watchword, "Whoso loseth his life for my sake and the Gospel's shall find it." The individual, living at the outset for himself alone, is confronted with the demand of Jesus Christ that he should yield himself to a higher service, and prove the constraint of a higher love. Let it be supposed that he yields to this demand, as thousands in Christian history have undoubtedly yielded to it. What is the result with regard to the personality thus surrendered? Is it enfeebled or submerged? On the contrary, experience shows that it has in general been enormously enriched, has become after a new fashion a potency of good, and is capable of a future only describable in such words as these: "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." In sober truth, the Chris-

tian individual by losing his life has found it. "By an evil loving of myself," says Thomas à Kempis, "I lost myself; and by seeking Thee alone, I found both myself and Thee."

(2) With this achievement in our mind, we pass to the family—the fundamental social unit. Here again, the supreme Teacher begins by speaking strong and startling words. He declares that family life must be surrendered, if it is to be worthily retained. He says: "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me." "Whosoever will do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother." He sends his chief apostle and many others to a life that is quite justly described in words put by poetic imagination into the lips of St Paul:—

> "Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter,
> Yes, without stay of father or of son,
> Lone on the land and homeless on the water,
> Pass I in patience till the work be done."

At this point also, it may be said that Christendom has theoretically learned the lesson. No Christian dreams of saying that the welfare of the family can supply the chief end of man. Christian men and women in innumerable cases have surrendered all that is most precious in family love for the glory of God and the furtherance of the Gospel.

With what result? With this result—that family life has come to its kingdom more completely than ever before, has assumed aspects of beauty unknown till the Son of Mary was born, and has justified all that is implied in the old saying, "The Christian Home is the masterpiece of the Gospel." The thing dedicated has become the thing won—and ennobled. By losing its life, the Christian "family" has found it.

(3) There is some pale reflection of this principle even in the more complex but less fundamental relation of clan to clan, or tribe to tribe. Primitive man could not conceive a loyalty to his own tribe which did not lead him to fight with other tribes. He had no vision of a tribal loyalty swallowed up in a national or patriotic loyalty. But partly, as we may believe, through the permeation of social life by Christian principle, we have reached a higher view than that of our ancestors. We see that the service of the clan can be dedicated to the good of the commonwealth, without itself being completely lost. Chattan no longer fights with Kay on the North Inch of Perth; nor does Red Rose in England war against the White. Nevertheless lesser tribal loyalties have not perished, but are only submerged in the greater national loyalty to which they are dedicated. There is still impulse in the motto so eloquently amplified by Ruskin, "Stand fast, Craigellachie"; still in-

spiration in the historic tartan worn by Seaforths or Camerons; still exhilaration, we may assume, in the singing of the March of the Men of Harlech. A great advance was made in civilisation when the nation was substituted for the clan as the object of patriotic sentiment. But it does not follow that clan loyalty has lost its beauty in our modern time, or that the self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice born of the clan spirit have lost their power of appeal. Who does not thrill to the power of clan sentiment, as depicted in 'Waverley,' when Evan Maccombich appeals to the Judge, during the trial of his clansman Fergus M'Ivor?

> "Evan Maccombich looked at him with great earnestness, and, rising up, seemed anxious to speak; but the confusion of the court, and the perplexity arising from thinking in a language different from that in which he was to express himself, kept him silent. There was a murmur of compassion among the spectators, from an idea that the poor fellow intended to plead the influence of his superior as an excuse for his crime. The Judge commanded silence, and encouraged Evan to proceed.
>
> 'I was only ganging to say, my Lord,' said Evan, 'that if your excellent honour and the honourable Court would let Vich Ian Vohr go free just this once, and let him gae back to France, and no' to trouble King George's government again, that ony six o' the very

best of his clan will be willing to be justified in his stead; and if you'll just let me gae down to Glennaquoich, I'll fetch them up to ye mysel', to head or hand, and you may begin wi' me, the very first man.'

Notwithstanding the solemnity of the occasion, a sort of laugh was heard in the court at the extraordinary nature of the proposal. The Judge checked this indecency, and Evan, looking sternly around, when the murmur abated, 'If the Saxon gentlemen are laughing,' he said, 'because a poor man, such as me, thinks my life or the life of six of my degree, is worth that of Vich Ian Vohr, it's like enough they may be very right; but if they laugh because they think I would not keep my word, and come back to redeem him, I can tell them they ken neither the heart of a Hielandman, nor the honour of a gentleman.'

There was no further inclination to laugh among the audience, and a dead silence ensued."

If it be urged that loyalty of this particular kind no longer exists in our modern world, and cannot therefore illustrate the principle embodied in the words of Jesus, "he that loseth his life shall save it," it may be admitted that the objection has force. Still, even in 'Waverley,' Fergus M'Ivor and Evan Maccombich had found an additional bond of brotherhood in the dedication of the courage and sacrifice of the clan to a Chieftain

nobler than Fergus, and to a Cause higher than that of any local patriotism.

(4) Now, in our view, the question of the hour is this: Can the vital forces of Christianity deal with love of **country**, as they have already, in some measure, dealt with love of self, love of family, love of clan? Can Christendom face a task scarcely as yet attempted, and persuade her sons and daughters of all nations to dedicate their patriotism to an end far beyond its own advantage—the glory of God, and the good of mankind? If so, we may be sure, in the light of past analogy, that patriotism will find such "death" lying very near to "resurrection."[1] She will give away her life, only to find it returned to her in fuller measure. Seeking "first the kingdom of God," she will find the ancient loyalties "added" to her. The land that is loved as an instrument rather than as an end, and cherished for the good that it can do rather than for the gain that it can win, will become tenfold dearer, lovelier, more delightful to her children. In the worship of her sanctuaries, an old psalm will be sung with new spirit and understanding:—

> "Lord, bless and pity us,
> Shine on us with Thy face;
> THAT TH' EARTH THY WAY AND NATIONS ALL
> MAY KNOW THY SAVING GRACE."

---

1 "'Dead, dead, and buried,' cried Roderick (speaking of his own moral despair). 'I am glad to hear it,' said Rowland, 'death of that sort is very near to resurrection.'"

—HENRY JAMES, *Roderick Hudson.*

CHAPTER II.

THE ELEMENTS IN PATRIOTISM

AND

THEIR GENERAL CONGRUITY WITH RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE

"I will speak first of our ancestors, for it is right and becoming that now, when we are lamenting for the dead, a tribute should be paid to their memory. . . . I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of Athens until you become filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by this spectacle of her glory, reflect that this empire has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it, who in the hour of conflict had the fear of dishonour always present to them, and who, if they ever failed in an enterprise, would not allow their virtue to be lost to their country, but freely gave their lives to her as the fairest offering which they could present at her feet."—PERICLES (reported by THUCYDIDES).

"Our true country is bounded on the north and the south, on the east and the west by Justice, and when she oversteps that invisible boundary-line by so much as a hair's-breadth, she ceases to be our mother, and chooses rather to be looked upon *quasi noverca*. That is a hard choice when our earthly love of country calls upon us to tread one path and our duty points to another. We must make as noble and becoming an election as did Penelope between Icarius and Ulysses. Veiling our faces, we must take silently the hand of Duty to follow her."—LOWELL, *Biglow Papers*.

"O thou, that dear and happy Isle,
The garden of the world erewhile,
Thou Paradise of the four seas,
Which Heaven planted us to please,
But, to exclude the world, did guard
With wat'ry if not flaming sword."

—ANDREW MARVELL.

CHAPTER II.

We attempted in the previous chapter to indicate some of the problems which arise when patriotism and Christianity are placed side by side in the field of view, and to show in a general way the urgency of these problems in our own era. We now proceed to inquire, with fuller analysis, what patriotism actually is, what are the elements which compose it, and how far these elements seem on the surface to be congruous with religious principle.

The history of the word "patriotism" in English speech has a measure of interest, but offers us little that is of value in our present quest. The word is surprisingly modern, not being found earlier than 1726; though the basal word "patriot" had been in use a century earlier. It is well known that the terms "patriot" and "patriotism" had for a number of years a partisan significance, due to their unfortunate admixture with the party politics of the day. Hence the blazing utterance of Dr Samuel Johnson on the evening when Boswell

"dined with him at a tavern with a numerous company," and the impenitent old Tory "suddenly uttered in a strong determined tone the apophthegm: 'patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.'" Boswell goes on to tell us that when he himself maintained in reply that certainly all patriots were not scoundrels, he was challenged by his audience to name one exception—whence we should gather that most of the "numerous company" were of Dr Johnson's opinion. It is obvious that "patriot" here has a purely sectional meaning; and the nature of this is hinted at by Dryden's earlier lines written of the "false Achitophel," who—

> "The pillars of the public safety shook
> And fitted Israel for a foreign yoke;
> Then, seized with fear, yet still affecting fame,
> Usurped a patriot's all-atoning name."

The reason of the Royalist poet's dislike of the term finds clearer expression in later lines of the same poem:—

> "Gulled with a patriot's name—whose modern sense
> Is one that would by law supplant his prince."

Dr Johnson himself, however, was not unwilling, in softer moods, to use the abstract word as a term of honour, as is plain to every one who remembers his famous dictum that he did not envy the man whose patriotism would not gain force upon the

plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona.

Fortunately for our present purpose, the word we are discussing has now shaken itself free from all sectional fetters. It has been defined as "the sentiment in which consciousness of nationality normally expresses itself." It would be better described from the viewpoint of these lectures as the human reaction to the Divine ordinance of nationality. But it is not necessary in our present quest to discuss in detail this or any other formal definition of the term. Scott's familiar lines give us all we want in the meantime—lines which would be too hackneyed to quote, were it not for the pleasure of restoring to wedded felicity the often divorced extremities :—

> "Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land?
> . . . . . .
> The wretch, concentred all in self,
> Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
> And, doubly dying, shall go down
> To the vile dust from whence he sprung,
> Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

We are to inquire, then, as to the nature of the strands which are woven together into the tenacious cord of the plain man's love of country? Can these strands be so disentangled as to permit some estimate of their individual worth? "Whence,"

in the language of Sydney Smith, "does this love of country, this universal passion, proceed? Why are not other soils as grateful, and other heavens as gay? Why does the soul of man ever cling to the earth where it first knew pleasure and pain, and, under the rough discipline of the passions, was roused to the dignity of moral life? Tempt the most friendless of human beings with the fairest face of nature . . . and why canst thou not bribe his soul to forget the land of his nativity; he will sit down and weep by the waters of Babylon, when he remembers thee, oh Sion." Such a question is perhaps not completely answerable. Patriotism is a vital passion, and all living things run into mystery. Nevertheless it is possible to reach certain general conclusions as to the nature of patriotism, and it behoves us to state what these are.

Three elements may be distinguished in normal patriotism—an intellectual, an emotional, and a dynamic element. There is, first, an intellectual element, an activity of the understanding, exercised upon facts, and concerned to give a reason for the hope that is in it. There is, secondly, an emotional element, the most vocal of the three—apt to mistake itself, and be mistaken, for the whole. Thirdly, there is a dynamic element, an activity of the will, prompt to carry into action the sugges-

tions of mind and heart, to devote itself sacrificially to the welfare of the fatherland, and to echo such an aspiration as that of the English poet: "Here and there did England help me; how can I help England? say." We may distinguish these elements by the help of a phrase of George Eliot used by her in another connection, and say that patriotism comprises "the vividness of a thought, the ardour of a passion, the energy of an action." Let us investigate these elements somewhat more closely.

I.

There is, then, in the first place, an **intellectual** or rational element in healthy patriotism. Convictions are embodied in the instinct, as well as emotions and impulses. Reason has its place, no less than passion. George Meredith has expounded to us the value of the "Comic Spirit" in probing us for what we are, and in fostering all that makes for sanity of thought and wholeness of character. "Whenever," he says, "men wax out of proportion, over-blown, affected, pedantic, fantastically delicate, whenever they run riot in idolatries, the Spirit overhead will look humanely malign, and cast an oblique light on them, followed by volleys of silvery laughter." There is ample room for the operations of this reflective and humorous spirit

in the development of healthy patriotism. In ancient Rome, Cæsar, riding to the Capitol in his hour of triumph, had a soldier to follow him reminding him that he was bald. The danger of extravagance in the expression of love of country is a besetment of every race ; and most races have raised a danger-signal through the invention of some term to brand exaggeration—" jingoism," " spread-eagleism," " chauvinism." Patriotism will only be kept aseptic when liberally treated with the salt of intelligence. If we are to love our country worthily, we must love it with a level head as well as with a clear conscience. It would appear that so acute a writer as G. K. Chesterton has been somewhat blinded by the brilliance of his own paradox when he tries to maintain that patriotism is of value in proportion to its non-reasonableness. He brings an objection against the imperialism of Rudyard Kipling, on the score that it is too rational to be really patriotic. Mr Kipling, he says, admires England, but he does not really love her. And he betrays his lack of love by the fact that he gives reasons for his admiration. When we really love our country (argues the critic) we ought to love her without reasons. To give reasons is to make our devotion the result of a criticism ; and this is to stamp our patriotism as second-rate. But for Mr Chesterton to argue like this is to ride a whim to death.

What would come over the world's love-poetry if the poet were forbidden to give reasons for his devotion? What is the most fervid love-song of Burns but a statement of the reasons why the lover loved? Even in a case which might seem more readily to justify Mr Chesterton's view—the love typified in the changeless affection of a mother for her son—where undoubtedly the emotion may seem to transcend reason, will any one maintain that the mother herself can give no reasons for her affection? Is her heart silent even in those instances where the lips can frame no apology? Can she not at the worst find a reason for her love in what her son *may* be, and in what by her help he is going to be? The loftiest love known to men is represented in its text-book as rejoicing in reasons: "we love Him *because* . . ."; "the love of Christ constraineth us *because* . . ." And though, certainly, the supreme love of all—the love of God, which is not "after the manner of man"—knows no "because" in respect of its beginning, but flows from free unmerited grace, it is justified in the eyes of Wisdom before its course is run, in the day when to "the principalities and powers in heavenly places" there is known through the Church "the manifold wisdom of God."

It would appear that any patriot who aims at mingling intelligence with patriotic emotion must cherish at least two convictions about the constitu-

tion of the world. He must hold in general that national distinctness is no mistake or misfortune, but of Divine appointment—an ordinance of Him who has indeed written one line of His thought upon each people. And he must further hold, more particularly, that his own nation has been entrusted with certain gifts and aptitudes which are necessary to human welfare, *and which have not been rendered inoperative at the moment by national wrong-doing.* Subject to a strict audit of the facts under the head we have italicised, it does not appear that religious principle has any objection to offer to either of these convictions, or any other attitude to assume towards them except that of hearty benediction. Let us deal with them in order.

i.

It is to be admitted that, as we saw in the first chapter, Tolstoi and others have impeached nationalism on many counts ; and that one of the ablest minds in Britain in the nineteenth century came to regard patriotism as the most dangerous delusion of mankind. It is true also, and a more serious difficulty to be fully discussed later, that the New Testament seems at first sight to abolish national distinctions, and to obliterate the dividing-line between races. Nevertheless, it is in the New Testament itself that we find such sanction of

nationalism as the incidental utterance of St Paul at Athens: "All nations has God created from a common origin, to dwell all over the earth, fixing their allotted periods, and the boundaries of their abodes." And, leaving the more specifically *Christian* grounds of approval of race-distinctness to a later chapter, it is enough to say at present that natural religion justifies national separateness as part of the providential order. History must be held by every theist to reveal God's will for mankind; and nothing can be more clear to those who do not put a fool's cap upon the past development of the world, than that no one nation has been permitted to stamp its sole character upon humanity, but that each has been commissioned to bring its special contribution to the common stock. Ruskin has spoken in 'The Stones of Venice' of the great principle of brotherhood, functioning "not by equality nor by likeness, but by giving and receiving; the souls that are unlike, and the nations that are unlike, and the natures that are unlike being bound into one noble whole, by each receiving something from, and of the others' gifts and the others' glory." Let any reasonable man call to mind the story of the nations, and the titles that are stamped upon the successive links of the ever-lengthening chain; let him repeat to himself the resounding names of Egypt and Babylon, Greece and Rome, Spain and France,

Switzerland and Holland, Britain and the United States; let him visualise the different types of character they have produced, the departments of human life they have variously enriched, and the separate contributions they have brought to the joint stock of human good; let him, finally, ponder the fact that the value and the immortality of each nation's achievement have been in direct proportion to its patriotism, and he will conclude that if it is indeed true that "man is parcelled out in men," the circumstance is not to be deplored, as Rossetti seemed to think, but rather regarded as a most express token of the Divine goodness to mankind. Let the reader further consider that as a fact of history the human race has always had to choose between nation-states in a plural of healthful variety and a world-state in its hateful singular—between the wholesome growth of national movements and the plots of a world-conqueror,—and he will form the conclusion that cosmopolitanism is no true friend to human welfare, but an enemy in disguise. Cosmopolitanism is an ugly word, tending to denote an ugly thing. Professing to lift men above mere love of country into love of humanity, it has always historically run in danger of sinking men below love of country into love of material gain. Most forms of it have been exposable to the reproach brought by Mazzini against the socialists of his day, that

they substituted the progress of humanity's kitchen for the progress of humanity. Commenting critically on Ludlow's epitaph that every land is a country to a brave man, Chatham said: "How dangerous is it to trust frail man with such an aphorism. . . . If all soils are merely alike to the brave and virtuous . . . all will be equally neglected and violated. Instead of every soil being his country, he will have no one for his country; he will be the forlorn outcast of mankind." To maintain that the Englishman and the Frenchman, the American and the Italian, would best serve mankind by laboriously discarding national characteristics, and achieving an artificial unity in temper, habits, and aptitudes, involves a hardihood in the man who maintains it, which should doom him to learn Volapuk, and to spend the rest of his intellectual life in reading the national writers of these peoples—Shakespeare, Hugo, Dante, Hawthorn—in that depressing amalgam. Coleridge has embodied in memorable words the considered judgment of mankind: "Patriotism is a necessary link in the golden chain of our affections; and the patriot turns away with indignant scorn from the false philosophy or mistaken religion which would persuade him that cosmopolitanism is nobler than nationality, and the human race a sublimer object of love than a people."

ii.

With respect, however, to the second intellectual conviction of normal patriotism — namely, that the divine "handwriting" of which Mazzini spoke has not been obliterated, but that the patriot's own country is at the selected moment worthy of the love and support of her people— there may obviously be, in any chosen hour of history, room for inquiry. A "country" is to be thought of as something which is in *movement* at a particular era, which has embarked on a certain course of action, which is guided by a certain policy. And the direction of this movement can be estimated, and must be judged at the bar of conscience. Patriotism can never claim exemption from ethical criticism. It can never pose as an Absolute, or present itself as a valid religion. While the patriotic spirit has a certain right of judgment over those subject to it, itself must be judged before a higher tribunal. A world taught by stern experience has to-day formulated a deliberate opinion that there may be a patriotism, fervid in a high degree, and sacrificially devoted to the welfare of a fatherland, which may nevertheless form a stumbling-block in the path of human progress, and of which it may be justly said that it had been better for the world if it had never been born. The often-quoted words of Edith Cavell, spoken

on the morning of her execution, "I see now that patriotism is not enough," show an insight to be coveted not only for personal religion, but for the wider sphere of national activity. Christian ethic cannot condone such action as underlies the confession of Cavour, that had he done in his own interests what he had done for the State, he would properly have been sent to the galleys. No matter how deep may be patriotic emotion, or how complete patriotic surrender, the sentiment must still justify itself at the bar of ethical intelligence, and must successfully plead that it has an end higher than the welfare of one spot on the globe. The exact statement of this plea must occupy our attention later. In the meantime we are content to say that on the lips of a lover of his country, who will take religious principle as his guide, there must always be some echo of the words addressed by the historic lover to his mistress :—

> "I could not love thee, Dear, so much,
> Loved I not honour more."

II.

The second element in patriotism is the **emotional** —the element which is pointed to by the phrase "love of country," and which represents to many people the essence of the patriotic instinct. Kindled

feelings of reverence and gratitude in the survey of the past, of affection and pride in the contemplation of the present, and of expectancy and hope in the outlook on the future are so manifestly involved in love of country, that the danger is probably rather to exaggerate this element than to neglect or minimise it. "*Mere* emotion is mere nonsense," Professor Flint used to say; and patriotism is not all sentiment, though in certain moods patriots are tempted to think so. Sense must be conjoined with Sensibility, in love of country no less than in Jane Austen's title. Nevertheless, we are bound to recognise that the emotional element in patriotism is one of quite singular richness and variety. Few instincts, if any, seem to strike more deep into the emotional nature of man than this, or to provide more ready channels for the overflow of strong feeling. The doctrine of Herbert Spencer is not an acceptable one, that we ought to love our country in exact proportion to a reasoned estimate of her merits. Such a doctrine comes itself far short of a reasoned estimate of the essence of love; and we are not surprised that Spencer was driven to confess that while to be called dishonest or untruthful would have touched him to the quick, to be called unpatriotic would have left him cold. The heart has its reasons, as Pascal said more worthily, "which the reason does not know."

To suggest to our minds the manifold variety of the springs wherefrom patriotic emotion is fed, it is enough to consider the feelings which are evoked in a patriot by retrospect of the **past,** by hopes of the **future,** as well as by the more incoherent but not less powerful appeal of the intermingled influences of the **present.**

i.

It is evident that the **History** of a settled country must needs unseal for its citizens warm springs of patriotic emotion. And it is equally evident that such unsealing is in thorough accordance with religious principle, so long as the spirit of the student be that embodied in the song of the sons of Korah : " We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work thou didst in their days, in the times of old." So matter-of-fact a writer as Macaulay claims in almost the first sentence of his 'History of England' that the general effect of his chequered narrative will be to excite thankfulness in all religious minds. There comes to us through history a strong sense of the debt we owe to the Motherland who bore and cherished us. After all, we are her children. She is in the full sense our Alma Mater. When one of the Psalmists, lifting up his eyes to Zion, declared " all my springs are in thee," the words are to

be thought of in the first instance as addressed by a patriot to the country of his birth and love. The Psalmist felt that all that he was had its roots in the land of his inheritance; and that the God who had been good to Israel had also been good to the men of Israel in giving them their portion in a land so favoured.

A special factor in the grateful pride evoked by the annals of the past is a sense of kinship with the heroes and leaders of olden days. It is felt that the great men of old, whose names shine bright in national history, belong to the generations which follow them; so that the beloved nation must be thought of as a sublime personality, with a longer and more glorious life than the life of any of her citizens. It is not for nothing that we of a later age have been bound in the bundle of life with men and women, the very recital of whose names kindles aspiration. It were—

> ". . . praise enough for any private man
> That Chatham's language was his mother-tongue,
> And Wolfe's great name compatriot with his own."

Such a sense of gratitude for noble personality, and such aspiration to be worthy of so splendid an inheritance, are clearly in thorough accord with religious principle. The Jew found himself brought nearer to God when he prayed to Him as the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob. He found a ground of appeal, when seeking the Divine bless-

ing, in the sacrifices made for righteousness by godly men of his race ; so that one of the Psalmists can boldly plead that God will remember David and all his afflictions—the vows he made and the hardships he underwent,—how for the Ark's sake he gave no sleep to his eyes nor slumber to his eyelids—how he took no rest till he had found a place for the Lord, and habitation for the mighty God of Jacob,—and can then found upon this plea the prevailing prayer : "for thy servant David's sake, turn not away the face of thine anointed." So also might a Scotsman recall, when praying for his own country, the years of the right hand of the Most High ; and make appeal to Heaven that the land of Columba and John Knox, of Rutherford and Leighton, of Andrew Melville and David Livingstone, might be led in the paths of righteousness for *their* names' sake, as well as for the honour of the greater Name, wherein was their help and ours. In the more secular interests of civil freedom, Wordsworth bids us remember that—

> "in our halls is hung
> Armoury of the invincible knights of old ;
> We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
> That Shakespeare spake ; the faith and morals hold
> Which Milton held."

Together with the sacred memory of heroes and heroines of former days, there is bound up a memory no less moving—that of **common national**

suffering, and common national deliverance. It has been held by some students of social history that without a certain experience of common peril and common rescue, the sentiment of nationality could scarcely come to birth, or at least could scarcely reach full growth in the consciousness of a people. In every building lighted by electricity there will be found numerous yards of copper wire, whose duty it is to carry the current, and which cheerfully permit themselves to be steeped in electric energy—but which give no light. On the other hand, there are hung here and there shreds of a dull intractable carbon—tough, obstinate, apparently bitterly hostile to the invading power—but when the electric current has torn its way through them, each filament is in a glow, and the glow illuminates a room. Radiance is born of resistance. Nationalism, like electricity, has often become most luminous when most resisted. It is at any rate in interesting harmony with this principle, that there has often seemed to be a special fervour of patriotism among the *smaller* nations of mankind—Greece, Sparta, Carthage, Switzerland, Holland, Poland, Scotland. Surrounded by powerful enemies, such states have seemed in imminent peril of extinction, and the common danger has welded the citizens together. We are reminded of the old superstition, full of significance, that a house stands long if its

foundations be watered with the blood of sacrifice.

It is natural to pause at this point to give room for the reflection that the knowledge of a nation's history does not come to its citizens by heredity or by instinct, but only by the same deliberate and systematic instruction as offers the key of knowledge in general. It has been seriously maintained that the British are the only people in the world who are not taught in childhood their own literature and their own history; and those who are best acquainted with the working men of our country will probably be the least inclined to scoff unreflectingly at the charge. We stand in the odd position among the nations of mankind of knowing less about ourselves than outsiders do. If an appeal to patriotism is reported by all qualified observers to fall absolutely flat upon the sympathies of an audience of working men since the Great War, the reason must be found in the fact that owing to their ignorance of the history of the nation, and of the achievements of the past, these men have been building their patriotism, like a pyramid on its apex, upon mere instinct, or upon the fighting impulse. A solid broad foundation will be uncovered, when each potential citizen is taught in childhood what his country has stood for during the long centuries of her island-story, what manner of heritage famous men of old have

handed down from one generation to another, and what degree of shame, therefore, will rest upon the people of a later day if they are false to the old traditions. Burke has well said that people will not look forward to posterity who never look back to their ancestors. There is a useful educational maxim in the summons of the son of Sirach: "Let us praise famous men, and the fathers that begat us."

ii.

Not only the history of the past, but awakened hopes and ambitions for the future, have power to act as a potent spring of patriotic emotion. The last of the Scottish martyrs, who yielded his life in the Grassmarket of Edinburgh in 1688, was nerved for the final agony by the vision of a motherland purified by present suffering. "Lord," he said, "I die in the faith that Thou wilt not leave Scotland, but that Thou wilt make the blood of Thy witnesses the seed of Thy Church, and return again to be glorious in our land." Blake's vision of the building of Jerusalem on English soil is too familiar to need quotation. The nature of a patriotic ambition which can justify its existence in the light of Christian teaching will form the special subject of study in a later chapter. It is enough to say here that the historic patriot who

saw from Mount Pisgah the future inheritance of his people was not the last in the succession of such seers.

iii.

An interesting feature of the emotional element in patriotism calls at this point for remark—a feature confronting us when we turn from the past or the future to the present—namely, that the warm rush of feeling in love of country is often most copiously evoked, not by what might seem the *great* things of national history or national expectancy, but by one or other of the "large aggregate of little things," which belong to scenery, to friendship, and to home. When Browning, an exile in Florence, wrote—

> "O to be in England
> Now that April's there,"

he went on to show on what things his mind was chiefly running :—

> "And whoever wakes in England
> Sees, some morning, unaware,
> That the lowest boughs and the brushwood sheaf
> Round the elm-tree bole are in tiny leaf,
> While the chaffinch sings on the orchard bough
> In England—now!"

If we interrogate candidly our own experience as to the moments in which we have been most

deeply moved by patriotic emotion, we shall probably find these linked, not with the deliberate singing of "Rule Britannia," or with the studied reading of the 'Expansion of England,' but with the casual glimpse of a Union Jack in a foreign land, the accidental mention of some local "bank" or "brae," the recalled—

> "Luve o' auld freends at kirk or fair,
> Auld-farrant sangs that memories bear
> O' but and ben ;
> Some wee oot-hoose far up the muir,
> Or doon the glen."

It was after seeing a country school in the Lake district, and opening his mind to its simple innocencies, that Keats wrote : "I never felt so near the glory of patriotism, the glory of making, by any means, a country happier."

Indeed, it is precisely this power of little things to elicit a rush of patriotic sentiment whose volume seems altogether disproportionate to the apparently trivial nature of the cause, which afresh persuades us to accept love of country as an original factor in human nature, comparable in simplicity and authenticity with the love of a son for his mother, or of a lover for his mistress. Patriotic feeling is often at its strongest when it is instinctive rather than deliberate. The habitual reserve of the Britisher makes him a peculiar martyr to dumbness in respect of his depeest

feelings, and peculiarly unable to trace these feelings to their source. He gladly falls back upon such half-articulate expression as he finds in the lines of Ford Maddox Hueffer :—

> "What is love of one's land? . . .
> I don't know very well.
> It is something that sleeps
> For a year—for a day—
> For a month,—something that keeps
> Very hidden and quiet and still.
> And then takes
> The quiet heart like a wave,
> The quiet brain like a spell,
> The quiet will
> Like a tornado ; and that shakes
> The whole of the soul."

III.

The third main element in patriotism—the element whose vital centre lies, not in the intellect or the emotion, but in the will and energy of the patriot—may be called for want of a better word the **Dynamic** or sacrificial element. It is this element which above all others has given to patriotism its honourable place in human history, and has exalted it as one of the most formative of the world's instincts. So old a writer as Bolingbroke has indicated the significance of this factor, when he says, in an often-quoted sentence : " patri-

otism must be founded on great principles and *supported by great virtues.*" In a famous address at Gettysburg, commemorating men who had fallen in the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln moved instinctively to a climax of the same character: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget *what they did* here." It is the instinct of normal patriotism to forget itself in the service of the land it loves; and to offer on behalf of the motherland that sacrifice in which life's supreme mystery is hidden. When Cavour lay in the grasp of death, he interrupted the priests, busy in their intercession: "Pray not for me, pray for Italy." No human motive that can be named, save only that of religious devotion, has so impelled common men to risk death, and suffer it heroically, as the motive of love of country. Patriotism may plead for itself at the bar of Christian judgment that it has inspired more golden deeds than any other sentiment, except the very highest. The roll-call of its famous exemplars is a long and glorious one. Only the eleventh chapter of Hebrews can offer a record surpassing in glory that embodying the names of Leonidas, Judas Maccabæus, William Tell, Hereward, Wallace, Joan of Arc, William of Holland, Kossuth, Garibaldi, Lincoln. "The whole problem of the Napoleonic wars becomes simple," says a modern historian, "if we bear this

dominating fact in mind; victory lay all along, not with generalship or seamanship, but with patriotism. When a whole people was united in the cause of an idea, no blunders could prevent that nation from triumphing in the end, even against Napoleon at the head of half Europe." It needs no proof that impulses of sacrifice, such as inspire patriotic deeds, are congenial with the religious spirit. Indeed, in contemplation of them, historic Christianity has often to bow her head in shame, and confess that her devotion to that higher Kingdom which is her charge and trust has often been less complete. One purpose of God in implanting patriotism as a normal human instinct may well have been to prepare the way for the higher loyalty of those whose lives declare plainly that they seek a country, and who are called to be citizens and patriots of the Kingdom of Heaven. The only criticism utterable by a Christian who is confronted with the story of patriotic self-sacrifice is self-criticism, as he examines himself with respect to the service or sacrifice he himself has shown, commensurate with that of the normal patriot.

The conclusion, then, to which we come provisionally at this stage of our inquiry is, that patriotism is an instinct native to man, and bearing marks suggestive of God's handiwork. No

staring incompatibility with religion precludes its use in Christian service. To ask whether it is congruous with a religious temper and attitude might well be held as idle as to ask whether family or parental instinct is so. Patriotism is something *given* in human nature, and there is no sign that it is passing away. The Christian cannot consent to regard a sentiment thus natural in itself, and hallowed by so many associations, as an inevitable exile from the Kingdom of Heaven, unless such a verdict is made absolutely necessary by later study of the authoritative records. Love of country seems just as compatible with love of humanity as love of home and children is compatible with love of country. As through family affection a man is encouraged to rise above self-interest, so through patriotic devotion he is lifted to an outlook wider than from his particular hearth; and prepared for that outlook, wider still when he remembers that God hath made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth. We ought to love our country, because it is part of God's world of ordered and varied design, and because it is *the* part of the world wherein Providence has decreed that our love may most readily become operative. It is not without the foreknowledge and deliberate counsel of God that we have had our birth in a certain spot of earth, at a certain hour of history. It is true

that we dare not seek to love our country as though such love were the first and great commandment; but it is also true that neither dare we love in this way ourselves, our family, or our Church. We hold, then, in the light we have so far discerned, that the individual dare not dispense with the spur of patriotism, seeing that it pricks him on to a nobler goal than self-concern; that the nation dare not ignore its unifying power, seeing that a house divided against itself cannot stand; and that the Church cannot neglect a sentiment so congruous with what is spiritual in man, and with such high aptitude to exercise and perfect human character. But we must pass on to test this provisional conclusion by a fuller study of the authoritative documents of our Christian faith.

CHAPTER III.

PATRIOTISM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

"We do wrong to the Old Testament if we deny that it comes from the same just and good God as the New. On the other hand, we do wrong to the New Testament if we put the Old on a level with it."—AUGUSTINE.

"It is to be observed that at many epochs in the world nationalism is the truest universalism. There may be a catholicism which is merely sectarian, and an alliance of a whole continent which is only a tyrannical compact of its kings, and a fellowship of art or science which is no more than a bond of selfish and disdainful refinement; and none of these have the true spirit of universalism such as is exhibited by the feeling of brotherhood within a single nation, drawing its various classes into one, and harmonising all its public and private life. The true and universal religion, says Kuenen, must be born of the nation, but rise above it. And this condition the religion of Israel fulfilled."—FREMANTLE.

CHAPTER III.

We enter with this chapter upon the most critical stage of our inquiry. We have sought on previous pages to disentangle the various threads of which the cord of patriotic instinct is woven, and to form some provisional estimate of their ethical worth. It has not appeared, so far, that any of the three elements comprising the instinct—intellectual, emotional, or dynamic—need be regarded as under the ban of religion, or necessarily repugnant to an enlightened conscience. There has seemed a possibility, even a probability, that the ties of patriotism are of God's own weaving, and that the sentiment itself may be an instrument of human good.

But Christianity is a revealed religion, and demands that in this matter as in others, we betake ourselves "to the law and to the testimony." As a matter of fact, patriotism has been indicted before the court of conscience on several counts—that it is rooted in pride, has been the most frequent cause of wars, is not taught by our Lord, finds no place in creed, catechism, or con-

fession, and is inconsistent with the universal love of our neighbour. These charges are seriously made, and formidably supported. They can only be refuted, if refuted they are to be, as the result of some candid investigation into the teaching of the Christian Scriptures. It is in the Scriptures that we learn, under supreme authority, what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man. We turn, therefore, in this chapter to the teaching of the Old Testament, that we may discover what it has to say to us on this important theme.

It is necessary, however, as we enter on this inquiry, to admit and emphasise the fact that not even the most thorough study of the Old Testament can yield a verdict on the validity of patriotism that shall be final for the Christian conscience. The maxim of St Augustine must here be well borne in mind: "We do wrong to the Old Testament if we deny that it comes from the same just and good God as the New; on the other hand, we do wrong to the New Testament if we put the Old on a level with it." The decisive documents of the Christian faith are found, not in the Old Testament, but in the New; and the difference of attitude on this subject between the earlier and the later revelation is very startling, and will bring us later on to the crux of the whole inquiry. Vast mischief has admittedly been done

in the past by the attempt to carry over into our Christian era the principles of the older dispensation without due consideration of the radical revision given to them by Jesus Christ. The story of such world-miseries as slavery, witch-hunting, and war furnishes abundant warning of the discredit brought upon Christianity by the attempt of those who could find no justification for a certain course of conduct in the teaching of our Lord and His apostles, to fall back upon the older code as of equal or co-ordinate authority. The story of national sentiment itself resounds with the same admonition. Nevertheless the teaching of the Old Testament on the subject of patriotism is of great importance, and of permanent interest. The general scope of it is well indicated in the tribute paid by St Paul to these older Scriptures, that they are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." In harmony with this description, the Old Testament yields us a "doctrine" of patriotism, which discloses to us the only basis on which it can be solidly built. It offers us ample material for the "reproof" of a greedy patriotism, and the "correction" of a giddy one. And above all, it presents us with the record of a steady "instruction in righteousness," which has for its purpose the discipline of a nation to be the organ of the divine will, so that even when that purpose turns out in

some measure to be disappointed, the indestructible principles remain for future reference. It should also be added that in the Old Testament we discover the historic background, against which the life and teaching of our Lord stand out, so that we recognise many convictions which He could take for granted in His ministry, and are thus withheld from building rashly on the argument from silence. The Old Testament does not hold its place in the canon simply as a dark foil for the glories of the New. It was in speaking of the Old Testament that our Lord said He came not to destroy but to fulfil. We are bound to give its teaching a prominent place in our thoughts, even in matters where it cannot speak the final word. Especially shall we find it of peculiar value in setting forth religion as a matter of public and national concern.

I.

The first general statement to be made upon the view of patriotism given us in the Old Testament is that it is nearly impossible to exaggerate the extreme intimacy of the connection discoverable in this ancient literature between the two things we are studying in these pages—love of country and love of God. From one point of view,

the Old Testament may be described as the Devout Patriot's Handbook. Patriotism was to the Jew inseparable from religion; all that was most holy, most fair, most pure in his religion was mirrored in the patriotism which was its visible counterpart. The wings of patriotism can bear it to no loftier height than it reached in Jewish history. The reason for this lies on the surface of the record. The story of the Old Testament is the story of a "chosen nation." All that the Jew believed about God was summarily reflected in the assurance that He "had showed His word unto Jacob, His statutes and His judgments to Israel." It would be as impossible to tear love of country from the religion of the Old Testament as to tear the figure of a cross from a Gothic cathedral; and for a similar reason. Even if, in the latter case, wanton hands should pluck the cross from the towers, snatch it from the altars, shatter it in the windows, deface it from the carving—even were the building levelled with the ground—still the whole structure is built on the figure of a cross as its ground-plan; and to the final stage of ruin the symbolism would abide. Similarly, when we turn to the Old Testament, we find the record shaped after a distinct ground-plan, and that plan the call and equipment of one particular nation for peculiar service. Historical books point to the origin of the people, and display its instruction and discipline at the

hands of Jehovah. Law-books preserve the national code. A psalter mingles patriotic with personal songs. Finally, the unique institution of prophecy, confessedly unparalleled in any other race, draws together the intellectual, emotional, and vital threads in patriotism, and weaves them into a religious unity, unknown before or since.

And yet it is to be observed, with no less emphasis, that the same book, which thus embodies and displays the spirit of patriotic exaltation, contains material for the discipline and correction of extravagant nationalism as no other record of a people's history has ever done. Love of country is never offered in the Old Testament as a substitute for love of God. Patriotism may never usurp God's throne. When we read in a recent study of Japan that patriotism and religion are one thing in that country, so that the religion is just the summed-up expression of the patriotism, "not to be divided from it but by death, the death of both," we are reading a statement that could find no warrant in a survey of Old Testament teaching. At the very outset of the story, the *purpose* of the call of Israel is clearly defined, and it is a purpose stretching far beyond the selfish good of the people themselves. The Divine dealings of later days are directed quite as much to the discipline and correction of the Chosen People as to their prosperity, and the frankness with which this is admitted is

one of the unique features of the story. The Hebrews were great, it has been justly said, because they were never entirely, or for more than a season, without their protesting voices. Always some men were raised up who would not be satisfied with any achievement. "It is this which marks them as a people of God—their inability to be satisfied with anything they have attained as final, or the best that God can do for them." Thus in reading the Old Testament, the devout reader hears the voice, "Come up hither," and becomes conscious that God has His own point of view, which the attentive scholar is imperatively called to share.

A picture-parable from the Old Testament itself may summarise in a general way the trend of its teaching on the relationship between patriotism and God. When Joshua, having crossed the Jordan, was looking forward to the conquest of the Promised Land, and contemplating the manifold difficulties of his task, he went forth one night to ponder and to pray. In this hour, when hopes trembled into fears, he saw a vision—"there stood a man over against him with a sword drawn in his hand." The stranger was manifestly divine; and Joshua put the momentous question, "Art Thou for us or for our adversaries?" But the answer was other than he looked for. "*Nay, but as Captain of the Host of the Lord am I now come.*"

That is to say, the Representative of high heaven had appeared as no partisan. He was there as the Leader of the Hosts of God, to support the righteous nation that did God's will. He had come, not to be enlisted, but to enlist others. No eager patriot might dare to hail him as an "unconditional ally," as a modern monarch dared to hail God.[1] Many a calamity of the Jewish people would have been averted in later days if this early parable had laid stronger grip upon their imagination. But it is at least to the abiding honour of the older dispensation that this principle appears thus distinctly, and thus early in the record.

II.

Passing to a more detailed examination of Old Testament teaching upon patriotism, we naturally open the volume at the Book of Genesis, bent on discovering whether this Book of "Beginnings" offers us any assured beginning for a coherent theory of love of country. And at once, within the compass of the first few pages, we are struck

[1] The exact words of the Kaiser should be kept on record. He is reported to have said in an imperial proclamation: "The year 1917, with its great battles, has proved that the German people has in the Lord of Creation above an unconditional and avowed ally, on whom it can absolutely rely. Without Him all would have been in vain. We are no longer alone."

by the emergence of two facts, which have an obvious bearing upon the subject in view. One is, that God is represented as the Creator of all mankind, without distinction of race or colour. The other is, that Divine sanction seems to be claimed also for the later separation of mankind into distinct peoples, and even (after however obscure a fashion) for the diversity of human tongues. In other words, we can disentangle two opposite and yet related principles from the first few chapters of Genesis, and these turn out to be manifestly basal principles in relation to our subject. The first is that of the **unity of man,** brought to light in the Creation story—that God (as St Paul expressed it later) "has made of one blood all nations of men." This is a restrictive principle, so far as love of country is concerned. For it means that all men alike are to be honoured in virtue of a fundamental equality of origin; and that Seneca was right when he said for the Stoics, "*homo sacra res homini.*" What is common to man is more fundamental than what is peculiar to men; and, important as we may consider racial distinctness to be, racial unity is more important still. Nevertheless, a second principle comes clearly to light in the immediate development of the history—that in the eyes of the writer of Genesis mankind has been divided into **separate nations,** not casually nor wantonly, but after the determinate counsel

and foreknowledge of God. We must complete the quotation from St Paul: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, *and hath determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation.*" This is the constructive principle of patriotism, as the first was a restrictive one. Not by accident or mishap have racial diversity and separateness of national life come to pass. The variety of men has place and function in the purposes of God no less assured than those of the unity of man. These—according to the early teaching of Genesis—are the twin principles governing our subject. If we compare the waves of patriotic feeling covering the earth to the waters of a great sea, then in the light of the second principle we say, "the sea is God's, and He made it"; in the light of the first we say, "hitherto shalt thou come and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." We must now expand these principles more fully, and trace their subsequent development in the Old Testament.

i.

The first principle—that all men are to be honoured as the offspring of God, independently of clime or colour—is the primary one of the two. Not only is it clearly taught in the statement that

God created man in His own image, but it is implied with little less clearness in the first sentence of that very ethnographical survey which delimits the territories of the various nations. In the tenth chapter of Genesis we have a survey of the world of the writer's day. It is therein assumed, as has already been hinted, that variety of racial life is to be accepted as part of the Divine purpose for the world. But the first sentence of the far-flung survey is, "These are the generations of the sons of Noah." Now a statement tracing to a single family the joint origin of mankind, and displaying the human race as grafted to a common stock of life, so that one common sap ran in all veins, had in its own day the merit of originality, and is far from devoid of arresting power at the present moment. The universal belief of the ancients was that the various races of men were divided from one another by an entirely impassable abyss. When the Hebrew revelation denied this and asserted universal blood-relationship, that revelation made history, as well as recorded it. It offered a basis for the historic assertion of the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal"—afterwards the battle-cry of Lincoln's anti-slavery campaign. It warranted the fuller statement of a living scholar, expressed in modern terms: "The first and most fundamental Christian principle of society is the principle of

the likeness or equality of human nature; the conception of the equal value of human nature in the sight of God; and the conception of the universal capacity of human nature for the highest life."—(Dr A. J. Carlyle.)

Accordingly, we are impressed thus early in our study by a sense of the balance and sanity of the view of patriotism derivable from the primitive teaching of the Old Testament. The patriot whose mind is in subjection to the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures will keep steadfastly before him that, however dear to himself his native land may be, men of all lands trace their parentage to a common Father, so that no man or community of men dare regard fellow-mortals as of baser clay.

"Our country claims our fealty, we grant it so—but then,
Before man made us citizens, great Nature made us men."

When the Greeks of olden time beheld in themselves a higher race, and in foreign peoples only "barbarians"; when the question was raised in later Jewish speculation as to how many Gentile souls were equivalent in God's sight to that of one Jew; when Brahmins claim to be sprung from the mouth of Brahma while lower castes spring from his foot; when our forefathers argued for slavery on the ground of a chasm of earthly destiny as between black men and white; when Friedrich Lange in his 'Deutsche Religion' said,

"the German people is the elect of God, and its enemies are the enemies of the Lord"; or when Englishmen of the present hour speak contemptuously of "lesser breeds," or call an educated Indian a "nigger"—then the Magna Charta of human fellowship has been torn up, and sooner or later the trespass against Society will be avenged. Vengeance often comes, as a matter of fact, through the tragic proof that the spirit of disdain, thus fostered as between races, cannot eventually be held in check as between members of the same race. The man who says "nigger" in India says "scum" in London or "cad" in Edinburgh. "This religion is highly improper," said a peeress of the eighteenth century, animadverting upon Methodism: "it teaches the wretches to crawl above their sphere." Not without divine prompting, St Paul implies, did even the heathen poet say, "we also are His offspring." And not without similar prompting, we may assume, did the later Latin poet win the plaudits of his audience with the words, "I am a man; nothing human is alien to me."

ii.

But we now turn to emphasise the second important principle which underlies the early teaching of the Book of Genesis, and from that starting-point extends its pervasive influence throughout

the Old Testament. This principle is that of the divine recognition of racial diversity. It is clearly implied in the world survey of Genesis x. that the sons of Noah, sprung as they were from a common stock, scattered over the world under God's cognisance, and manifested different characteristics in accordance with His purpose. Howsoever we may interpret the story of the Tower of Babel, at all events it points to divine counsel and foreknowledge even in the matter of diversity of human language, and offers little forecast of a cosmopolitan world, where the babies all learn Esperanto. When we consider how each nation among the races of men has expressed in a tongue of its own what has been noble and beautiful in national character; when we reflect how no one of the richer languages of humanity can be perfectly translated into another; and when we remember the treasures of racial genius embodied in such languages as Greek, Latin, French, German, English, we shall be content rather to emphasise the providential origin of the diversity of Genesis xi., than to dwell upon its secondary character as a punishment. In the Pentecostal miracle, according to St Luke, each country was addressed in its own tongue.

It is furthermore to be observed that the conception pervades the Old Testament of a profound concern on the part of Jehovah with national

life in all lands, so that Gentile nations as well as the Jews share in a divine vocation. It might even be urged that the peculiar call to the Jewish people given through Abraham is only a "special case" of the call to *all* nations, implied in the survey of Genesis x. Just as the Creation story, it might be held, discovers the bed-rock upon which are broad-based the later developments of Providence and Redemption, so the record of the providential separation of all nations by their Creator in the earlier story is the necessary presupposition of the more special separation of one peculiar people to be, after a more exclusive fashion, the channel of the divine purpose. Let us listen to the prophet Amos, as he rebukes the false nationalism which would recognise no other as akin to it: "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have not I brought up Israel out of Egypt, *and* the Philistines from Caphtor, *and* the Syrians from Kir?" (Amos ix. 7). Isaiah looks forward to the day when Israel shall be a third with Egypt and with Assyria, and when the blessing of the Lord shall be spoken in this form: "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance" (Isa. xix. 25). It is of Cyrus, a heathen king, that the voice from the Unseen asserts, "I have girded thee, though thou hast not known me." The

prophets frequently speak of Gentile nations as instruments in God's hand, even if at times only for chastisement: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will send and take Nebuchadnezzar *my servant*, and will set his throne upon these stones that I have hid, and he shall spread his royal pavilion over them" (Jer. xliii. 10). A Talmudic legend carries this idea so far as to assert that the Law was offered first to the other nations, but only Israel accepted the yoke. And in Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, there is a notable rendering in the Septuagint: "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, . . . He set the bounds of the heathen according to the number of the angels of God, but He Himself took up His abode in Israel." That is to say, while God Himself took up His abode in Israel, over the heathen He placed His angels. Heathenism was not left without the ministry of divine operation—to each separate nation, its separate angel-minister.

Thus it would appear that, according to the Old Testament, there are two focuses and not merely one which determine the just orbit of national relationships. At the one focus there stands the conception of unity of origin, at the other there stands the correlative conception of ordained diversity of race. The maxim of Aristotle, that man is born to be a citizen, seems to have Old Testament support. Martensen's fuller statement

does not appear to go beyond the facts: "As nationality is the natural basis of the State, so it is also the condition of all human development. Even the Spirit of God, as Pentecost further testifies, would address men of every nation in their own mother-tongue. Hence his nationality is an indispensable possession for each individual." Chesterton's characteristic dictum may supply a modern statement of the principle involved: "I want to love my neighbour, not because he is I, but precisely because he is not I. Love desires response, therefore love desires division. If souls are separate, love is possible."

III.

We shall now proceed to inquire what are the characteristic features of the patriotism manifest in the Old Testament, and controlled in its development by the twofold conviction we have described. It will be found convenient to speak of these features under three heads, corresponding to the analysis of the first chapter, and to consider the basis in *intelligence*, the expression in *emotion*, and the embodiment in *action*.

i.

The first point to be made is that the patriotism depicted in the Old Testament is rooted in **intelligence.** It is more than a feeling or an enthusiasm. The Jewish patriot could give a reason for the faith that was in him; he held the most coherent philosophy of history the world has ever known. If he believed that no nation upon earth was like Israel, he believed it upon a quite intelligible ground. The ground was that God had set Israel apart as His Chosen People. The supreme Power in the universe had allied this particular nation with Itself for wise and holy ends, and these ends do not conflict, as it turns out, with the diverse vocation of other peoples. Thus to the Jew his nationality was a sacred thing, and patriotism was a sacred duty. Patriotism, indeed, was simply the grateful recognition on earth of a vocation decreed in heaven. It is, of course, in no way surprising that this claim of the Jews to be a Chosen People lent itself at times to the distortion of arrogance, and tended to make the race unpopular. Just as the claim of an individual to be one of the "elect" has often proved offensive to his neighbours, so the claim of the Jews to be an elect nation has been apt to provoke other peoples to wrath or scorn. "Sinai," as the rabbis said, "has brought forth Sinah (hatred)." The

hatred of the Jews in Germany ("Judenhetze") may spring from the conviction that there cannot be *two* Chosen Peoples!

Nevertheless, two things must be said in support of the Old Testament conception of a Chosen People. One is, that as a matter of fact the Hebrew claim has been justified by history. The place occupied by the Jews in the long story of human development is undeniably unique. The gifts and calling of God have in this matter been without repentance; so that amid whatsoever shadow, and mingled with whatsoever tragedy, they brought in the day when "there came out of Zion the Deliverer." No Christian can be blind to the extent to which our Saviour's words have been fulfilled, "salvation is of the Jews." The other remark to be made in support of the Old Testament conception is, that it is quite consistent with the recognition of a parallel divine call to other nations. "There is nothing unique," says a modern Jew, "in considering yourself a Chosen People." We reflect that no sane modern statement of the doctrine of election would be put in terms implying a correlative doctrine of reprobation. One of the prophets foresaw that the Temple should be a house of prayer for all nations; and another foretold that "from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, God's name should be great among the nations." The 100th Psalm is a challenge to

all lands, claiming that Jehovah is the Maker of all men alike. "Before the eyes of the Psalmist," says Professor Menzies, "there rises the noble vision of a worship in which the whole world will join, a universal religion which will be recognised by all nations, in which men of every race will gladly flock together to take their part." And in our later day we see nothing inconsistent in believing that Israel was divinely called to be a Chosen People in respect of all that concerns the furthering of man's highest welfare, while we also believe that other nations were called to other tasks—Greece to perfect the ideal of beauty, or Rome to exhibit the grandeur of law. "When the fulness of time was arrived," says Neander, "and Christ appeared, then it was that all the threads, hitherto separated, of human development were to be brought together and interwoven in one web."

It is very specially to be emphasised that the vocation of Israel depicted and illustrated in the pages of the Old Testament is a vocation to service no less than to privilege. The most striking illustration of this fact lies in the terms of the original call given to Abraham and recorded in Genesis xii. Here—to use Isaiah's vivid image—we find the rock whence this people was hewn, and the hole of the pit whence they were digged. And what are the terms of the divine

call? "Get thee out of thy country unto a land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and *thou shalt be a blessing, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*" Nationalism is revealed, in this instance at any rate, as the chosen instrument for the carrying out of the divine purpose; but, on the other hand, nothing can be more plainly stated than the end towards which this purpose moves. It is not the blessing of Israel alone, but the blessing of the world. The current of national life is not to be primarily self-regarding, but to set towards the larger life of humanity. The history of the descendants of Abraham was designed to illustrate the truth enshrined in the great saying of Hooker: "The greatest felicity that felicity hath is to spread and enlarge itself."

The tragedy of the Jewish people in later centuries has lain in their failure to realise the true significance of their national calling. In spite of the terms of the call of Abraham, crying aloud from early records, their nationalism has too often become self-centred, and has "to party given up" what was "meant for mankind." The Jew forgot that—

> "Heaven does with us as we with torches do,
> Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
> Did not go forth of us, 'tis all alike
> As if we had them not."

It is startling to find in an authoritative article upon Judaism, written for the 'Dictionary of Religion and Ethics,' the statement that Judaism "has no missionary aim. . . . She has not to compete with the more popular expositions of religion; her *raison d'être* is not to rival the successful missionary activity of her daughters, the Church and the Mosque." And Dr Glover quotes another Jewish writer as saying, in a more contrite spirit: "To this day it is confessedly the weakness of Judaism that it offers no impulse, and knows no enthusiasm for self-sacrificing love, where the interests of the tribe are not concerned." How strangely alien are such boasts or confessions to the primitive charter of Hebrew nationalism; and how clearly they show that Jewish patriotism has missed the way. Nevertheless, let us note as we pass on, that we cannot fairly charge to the nationalism of the Old Testament a fault which belongs to its misconception, and which can be corrected from the pages of the ancient Scriptures themselves.[1]

The Old Testament conception of a Chosen

[1] Commenting on 1 Thess. ii. 16, Dr Milligan makes a striking quotation, as showing the attitude of the stricter Pharisees towards other nations. "Haec autem omnia dixi coram te, domine, quoniam dixisti quia propter nos creasti primogenitum saeculum. Residuas autem gentes ab Adam natas dixisti eas nihil esse et quoniam salivae adsimilatae sunt, et sicut stillicidium de vaso similisti habundantium eorum."—4 Ezra vi. 55.

People has permanent beauty and value in relation to our subject. The present writer, indeed, doubts whether there is any possibility of a modern patriotism, at once religious and intelligent, except as linked with this or some equivalent conception. There is no reason, as we have seen, why a modern claim to be a Chosen People should not whole-heartedly welcome similar claims on the part of other races. The formula for to-day is not "*the* Chosen People." In the unique case of the Jews, the definite article may have seemed in keeping; for there was little extravagance in the forecast of Balaam that "this people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." But in our more complex day, we may well be content with the more modest prefix. If we claim, for instance, that Great Britain is "*a* Chosen People" (with memory of "D.G."), we are only claiming for the region of national life what every Christian already believes in the region of personality. We are only assuming that if every man's life is indeed, as Bushnell taught us, a plan of God, no less than this need be claimed for the life of a nation. As the individual has in the divine purpose a place to fill and a work to do, so it is with the race. Abraham Lincoln gave utterance to a remarkable saying in 1862: "I hold myself in my present position, and with the authority invested in me, as an instrument of Providence. I am

conscious that all I am, and all I have, is subject to the control of a Higher Power." Was Lincoln to be commended for saying this as a man, and yet frigidly precluded from saying it as the spokesman of his country? There is no arrogance in the claim to be a Chosen People; since it is only St Paul's "I am what I am," writ large, and to be reverently qualified by the same preface, "by the grace of God."

Now upon this basis of a doctrine of vocation, a religious patriotism can be built securely. For such patriotism rests not on the whim of man, but upon the eternal purpose of God. Its basis lies outside the realm of national self-will, or the impulses of corporate vanity. Just as in the personal sphere the doctrine of divine sovereignty was said in a happy phrase to have put iron into the blood of our forefathers, so this self-same doctrine in its wider sweep makes patriotism strong as well as beautiful, intelligent as well as ardent. The emphasis is removed from man's choice to God's. In the Old Testament, the thought is not that Israel had chosen God, but that God had chosen Israel; not by way of patient search and partial discovery had they found Him, but by way of sovereign and irresistible choice had He found and separated them. Thus patriotism is simply the human response to the divine call to a people. The national creed is sung in such words as these: "He hath

made me a polished shaft, in His quiver hath He hid me."

It is obvious, of course, and has been already admitted, that such a doctrine of a Chosen People offers itself now, as in former days, to distortion; and that, when the doctrine becomes corrupt, its corruption—"like that of all noble things under the devil's touch"—is a very shocking one. "Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds." Nevertheless the doctrine stands clearly forth from Old Testament teaching, and commends itself to reason. Just as a man ought to cherish his own individuality as his one instrument of fellowship with others; just as Henry James's young sculptor—confronted in his eager ambition by a brow-beating reference to Michael Angelo—showed no real arrogance in exclaiming, "Oh, but Michael Angelo was not *me*"; so will a nation that asserts eternal Providence and justifies the ways of God to man do well to claim its own corporate inheritance in the increasing purpose of the ages. Only when notes are different is harmony possible, only when temperaments and aptitudes vary can each people be called to cast its own into the common stock.

ii.

We pass from the intellectual to the emotional aspect of the patriotism depicted in the Old Testa-

ment; and here we find, as might justly be expected, that a sentiment so deeply rooted in intelligence has flowered in varied and many-coloured beauty. The emotional content of Hebrew patriotism is a very rich one. It seems as though all the constituents of human nature had combined to lay their offering of gratitude, pride, and devotion on the shrine of the land they love. Affection for home and kin; attachment to the soil; pride in a noble ancestry; hope for the future based on deliverances of the past; loyalty to king and law and fellow-countrymen; willingness to sacrifice life itself for national welfare,—all these are elements in that Jewish patriotism which is justly proverbial for its intensity, and is not even yet outworn. Instances are scattered through all the Books of the Old Testament. Our treatment of them must be essentially selective.

(1) *Love of kin and home*, mirroring love of country in the smaller realm of domestic life, is an immensely powerful factor in Hebrew patriotism. Nowhere shall we find the great saying of Bagehot better illustrated that "a cohesive family is the best germ for a campaigning nation." The history of Israel takes its rise, as we have seen, in the call of a family, and that family a small one, and to the end the character of the source seems to fix the quality of the stream. Conceptions of good and evil are frequently expressed in terms of domestic

relationship. "Abraham was gathered to his kin" —there is the Hebrew view of blessing in death. "The transgressor shall be cut off from his kin" —there is the Hebrew view of a curse in life. The general teaching of the Old Testament is in thorough accord with the saying of John Bright, that "the nation in every country dwells in the cottage"; or with the more formal pronouncement of modern sociology, that the family is the "ultimate social unit." It sets its seal to the later words of our own King, that "the foundations of national greatness are set in the homes of the people." Where shall we find so close a knitting of the all-important family tie as in the pages of the Old Testament, from the stories of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis to the very last words of the volume, "I will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse"? When we look in through the open door upon some of the family groups of the Old Testament—Abraham, Sarah, Isaac; Isaac, Rebekah, Jacob; Jacob and his sons; Naomi, Ruth; Hannah, Samuel; the house of Obed-edom; the sons of Rechab—we see already some foreshadowing of the beautiful New Testament conception of the "Church which is in the house"; some adumbration of the truth so tenderly expressed by Clement of Alexandria, "Our Lord said that where two or three were gathered in His name,

there was the true Church. Who are these two or three but the father, the mother, and the child? " A patriotism with a rallying-point in every home will offer a focus of heat as well as of light; it will be emotionally ardent as well as intellectually sound.

(2) A well-spring of patriotic emotion often found overflowing in the pages of the Old Testament, is affection for this or that *spot* of earth which has become to the individual soul the symbol of all that constitutes the fatherland.

> "God gave all men all earth to love;
> But since our hearts are small,
> Ordained for each one spot should prove
> Beloved over all."

Many instances of this local patriotism have been carried over from the Old Testament into popular speech, and typify for all time the call of home. Jacob saying to his household, "Let us arise and go up to Bethel"; Naomi turning in her old age to the home of her childhood; David longing for one draught from the well of Bethlehem; the psalmist remembering Zion in far-off Babylon,—these are now classical instances of patriotic home-sickness. Who shall define the exact nature of the emotional tug at the heart of Hadad, when that little-known exile was cross-questioned by a king of Egypt as to precisely *why* he proposed to return to his own country? "What hast thou

lacked with me?" said the wondering monarch, "that, behold, thou seekest to go to thine own country?" And Hadad answered, "Nothing; howbeit, let me go in any wise" (1 Kings xi. 22). "*Nothing; howbeit, let me go in any wise*"—there speaks the authentic voice of the home-sick patriot, who in vision beholds some familiar scene over the hills and far away. It is the same voice as is heard in the most famous anonymous lines in British literature:—

> "From the lone shieling on the misty island
> Mountains divide us, and a waste of seas—
> Yet still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
> And we in dreams behold the Hebrides."

This warm feeling for locality was strengthened in the Jewish mind by a proud sense of the beauty of their country, and by their steadfast belief that in respect of situation the lines had fallen to them in pleasant places, and that they had a goodly heritage. And although the impression is widespread to-day that this idea was exaggerated, and that Palestine is a rather disappointing country in outward aspect, those who traversed the land with the British force under Allenby know that this reaction has been carried much too far. A frequent comment of our Scottish soldiers on the land their valour did so much to free was, "it's a bonnie country"; and those who caught the tone of the exclamation report a warm emotion brimming

over the words. "Come in," says Sir George Adam Smith, in his 'Historical Geography of the Holy Land,' "with the year at the flood, with the springing of the grain, with the rush of colour across the field, the flush of green on the desert, and in imagination clothe again the stony terraces with the vines—then, even though your eye be Western, you will feel the charm and intoxication of the land." Assuredly, the writers of the Old Testament loved their country, not merely in its general aspect, but in its individual features; and were moved to dwell, as all such love is moved, upon traits that might seem trifling to other than the lover. The passionate human love depicted in the Song of Songs draws some of its inspiration from the nature-setting in the background—just as Annie Laurie's "promise true" was all the more delectable to her lover because of the "Maxwelltown braes" that were "bonnie," and that overheard the whispered vows. The very smallness of the land of Palestine may have tended to make its patriotism more manageable, more aware of itself. Phrases abound in the Old Testament, where a sense of detail in scenery, by confining the emotion in a narrower channel, seems to make its flow more impetuous. "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river-side, as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar

trees beside the waters." "The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey." "This people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly." "As mother-birds hovering, so will the Lord of Hosts defend Jerusalem." "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion, on the sides of the North, the city of the great King." And how diplomatically does Gideon appeal to local patriotism, and make handsome concession to the prejudices of a rival tribe, when he says to the petulant warriors of Ephraim: "What have I done in comparison of you? Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Abiezer?"

(3) Few more potent springs of patriotic emotion are to be found than those which lie in *cherished memories of national peril and national deliverance.* So capable a sociologist as Bagehot holds that only in the furnace of national tribulation can the various constituents of national life be fused into a compact unity. The reader, as we saw in a previous chapter, who recalls the story of Greece or Carthage, of Switzerland or Holland, of Poland or Scotland, will find proof that the crushing attacks of ambitious neighbours have often com-

pressed the defiant sense of nationality into a compact mass. They have acted like the shock or jar given to the chemist's phial of super-saturated fluid, which in a moment turns the liquid into spears of crystal.

In the Old Testament, the many signal deliverances of Israel find their first illustration and abiding type in the miracle of the Exodus and the rescue at the Red Sea. Because of what God had wrought for His people on "that night much to be remembered unto the Lord," the nation of Israel beheld itself as a unified folk, made one through the power of a corporate indebtedness. The commemorative feast of the Passover—the most venerable religious ordinance in the world—was appointed to fan into a flame year by year the embers of patriotic gratitude, and to reawaken the worshipful question, "Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods?" And according to the view of the Hebrew historians, the later story of Israel was simply the tracing into a long bright line of this initial glow-point of divine favour. The first mercy was the pledge and pattern of all later mercies. Even when, in addressing the exiles in Babylon, God undertakes to do a "new thing," and to make for them, not "a path in the mighty waters," but the converse of that—"waters in the wilderness"—it is the first initial deliverance of the Red Sea on which faith is based. "Thus saith the

Lord"—such is the preface to the promise—"which maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters." Dean Stanley's memorable statement is as true in fact as it is admirable in expression: "The Israelite annals, unlike the records of any other nation, claim no merit, no victory of their own. There is no Marathon, no Regillus, no Tours, no Morgarten. All is from above, nothing from themselves."

There have been moments in our own island story when the sense of signal divine deliverance has been almost equally distinct. "When the danger had passed," says a recent historian, writing of the Armada, "it seemed as if God Himself were on the side of England. From the Queen downwards, the feeling was, 'Not unto us, O Lord.'" "Never was fleet so strong," said Drake, speaking of the Armada, "but the Lord of strength is stronger." [1]

(4) A unique feature of patriotic emotion in the Old Testament is the national sense of pride and joy in the *law* of the country. We are so accustomed to think of the word "law" in the Bible as a theological term, that we forget that, if it was

[1] May we not reverently connect these incidents with our own time by paraphrasing the words of the prophet Jeremiah (xxiii. 7, 8): "The days come that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which blew with his winds and the Armada was scattered, but, The Lord liveth which brought up and led his people out of the North country, and gave them deliverance in the Great War"?

indeed, religiously, the law of God, it was also, politically, the law of Israel—determining in a perfectly natural sense the code of justice under which the people lived, and the legislative enactments which fenced their daily life. It is a very rare phenomenon to find in any country so overflowing a satisfaction with the national code of laws, and so profound a sense of its righteousness, as we find in many parts of the Book of Psalms. If it be objected to this that the Hebrew law was largely ceremonial, so that the warm appreciation of the psalmists was a religious exercise rather than a political or social one, it is to be observed again that, as a matter of fact, it is not of the laws of ceremony or ritual that the psalmists chiefly speak. Now and again, it is true, we find in the Psalms allusions to the laws of the levitical code —to forbidden drink-offerings and proscribed dainties, to new moons and solemn feast-days, to burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering,—but as a rule when the psalmists speak of the law, it is the moral and political, not the ceremonial law to which they refer. As Dr Emery Barnes puts it with reference to the author of the 119th Psalm: "In his eyes at least the law of Moses is not a mere mass of arbitrary rules. It is Torah, that is teaching. It contains Testimonies, impressing upon man the nature of the God whom he serves; Promises of deliverance and good; Judg-

ments solving difficult questions of conduct. It is marked throughout by Righteousness, that is, by that perfection of goodness which belongs to God alone."

It would therefore be a parallel phenomenon to what we often find in the Psalms, if modern political writers showed not merely a passive contentment with the law of their own particular country, but a whole-hearted happiness in a rule so just, and in a legislation so manifestly crowned with divine approval, as the rule and legislation under which they have blessedness to live. It is pleasant to find that such writers have not been unknown in our own British history. Speaking of the famous 'Commentaries' of Blackstone, Mr Wingfield Stratford says: "Blackstone worshipped the law of England with an intense ardour—he approaches the task of commenting upon it with something of the blindness of a lover. His four volumes are one long panegyric, and the reader can scarcely help being carried along by the writer's own enthusiasm; the law which once appeared so harsh and tedious takes on the form of a beautiful and beneficent genius, the embodiment of God's own justice, standing between him and every sort of injustice and tyranny." Some utterances of Milton and Burke seem touched with the same fervour. William Camden, the Elizabethan, writing "in praise of Britaine," says under this head:

"As for government ecclesiastical and civil, which is the very soul of a kingdom, I need to say nothing whenas I write to home-born, and not to strangers." Manifestly we should not have advanced beyond the level of Old Testament teaching, but rather lingered woefully behind it, if such panegyrics seem to us ridiculous; or if any irony surrounds the statement that the laws of Britain ought to be also the laws of God.

iii.

We have now taken stock of the patriotism of the Old Testament in respect of its ground in reason, and of its overflow in feeling. But the final test of Hebrew patriotism, as of all other, must lie in its dynamic power—that is to say, in its capacity to lead towards golden deeds of service and sacrifice, and to render the patriot "ripe for exploits and noble enterprises." In George Eliot's phrase, patriotism, to be complete, must pass from the vividness of a thought and the ardour of a passion to the energy of an action. Of such golden deeds inspired by love of country, the Old Testament is full. Every educated man can call over the roll of its famous characters, and can recount the achievements which have made their names to shine in the national record "like the stars for ever and ever." The eleventh chapter of Hebrews

contains a shining catalogue of such names, and gives us the moving summary of their deeds, that they "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, escaped the edge of the sword, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." But instead of reviewing incidents familiar to every Bible reader, we shall single out one particular form of patriotic heroism, less striking to the eye but not less important, wherein the goodly fellowship of the Hebrew Prophets blazed out a new path for the human race. We mean, the path wherein a patriot encounters the hardest of all tasks in patriotic sacrifice—the censuring and withstanding his country, where he thinks his country wrong. Certain patriots have had to play the part of those

> "Who, loving as none other
> The land that is their mother,
> Unfalteringly renounced her
> Because they loved her so."

This is by far the most crushing burden a patriot can be called to carry. Other forms of patriotism are elementary compared with this. To love one's country when it is worthy of love, and then, as moved by that impulse, to seek to serve it bravely, is no doubt a high task, and one covetous of the best that human nature can supply. But it is a task containing its own reward. The impulse to fulfil it rouses all the dormant faculties to healthful activity; the undertaking of it pleasurably stirs

the blood; and the even partial achievement of it brings deep heart-content. But to love one's country in the very hour when bitter shame must accompany the love; to care for it in its moral ugliness as Beauty cared for the Beast, hoping against hope for transformation, but conscious (unlike Beauty) that no caress will work the miracle—such a task touches the essential nerve of devout patriotism as nothing else can do. It means that the patriot must stand alone, amidst a crowd of fellow-countrymen who impugn the very love which consumes him. The more he loves, the less he will seem to love. He must choose between two loyalties, in the consciousness that the higher of the two makes no appeal to those whose support he would most value. Misunderstanding must infect and poison the air he breathes. Robert Browning, in his poem entitled 'The Patriot,' has described the man who, one short year before, had beheld the housetops crowded with cheering hero-worshippers, saying in disillusionment—

> "There's nobody on the housetops now—
> Just a palsied few at the windows set;
> For the best of the sight is, all allow,
> At the Shambles' Gate—or, better yet,
> By the very scaffold's foot, I trow."

"There is something in the mere utterance of

truth," George Adam Smith has said, "which rouses the very devil in the hearts of many men."

Yet this task of withstanding popular sentiment was not merely the occasional hap, but the almost constant vocation of many of the Hebrew prophets. In such an instance as that of Jeremiah, we see the strain and stress of it arriving at such a pitch, that the fellow-prophet of a later age is thought to have beheld in him the first foreshadowing of a tragedy not finally staged till the advent of the Man of Sorrows: "He hath no form nor comeliness . . . there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men . . . we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised and we esteemed Him not."

Yet it was this patriotism, clinging to its country even in its country's sin, daring to lose its life without much hope that it would find it, willing to turn its back to the fatherland in turning its face to God, and receiving the appointed reward in being turned to the fatherland again, and bidden to pity and redeem it—it was this patriotism which was the real means of accomplishing the divine purpose in the choice of Israel. For such patriots became the nucleus of that "Remnant," through whom God's purposes for the Chosen People were after all accomplished, and the promise made to Abraham brought to due fulfilment. To one of

them was the assurance given, which shone like an emerging star of hope in many a cloudy sky of later days : " Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not ; for a blessing is in it : so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all."

CHAPTER IV.

PATRIOTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

"The formula for the specific nature of Christianity cannot fail to be complex. Christianity resembles, not a circle with one centre, but an ellipse with two focuses. . . . Neither of the poles may be completely absent, if the Christian outlook is to be maintained." — TROELTSCH. (Quoted by VON HÜGEL in *Eternal Life.*)

"The circle is not the true fundamental line in geometry."— WHITEHEAD, *Introduction to Mathematics.*

"Whatever the world thinks, he who hath not meditated much upon God, the human soul, and the *summum bonum*, may possibly make a thriving earth-worm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot."—BISHOP BERKELEY.

CHAPTER IV.

With the subject of this chapter—patriotism in the teaching of the New Testament—we come to what is unmistakably the knot-point of the discussion in which we are engaged. Is there any room within the confines of New Testament teaching for the commendation or even for the toleration of love of country? The question is not a simple one; and there are students of the subject, both scholarly and devout, who answer it with an uncompromising negative. The Gibson Prize in the University of Cambridge was recently awarded for an essay on this very topic, now duly published; and the conclusion of the essay is that "patriotism is not in itself a Christian virtue." On a more conspicuous level of scholarship the Abbé Loisy has said dogmatically, "the Gospel knows nothing of patriotism." We have already quoted the saying of a popular Church leader of our time: "The day of patriotism is over. It fosters narrowness, bigotry, selfishness, greed, and hatred. The Spirit of God is creating a new

humanity." Granting cheerfully, such students of the subject would say, that there is a basis for patriotic ardour in the doctrine of the Old Testament, we find the specific difference between the Old Testament and the New to be precisely this, that while the religion of the former is national, the religion of the latter is universal. Under the old dispensation, the religion of a Jew called him to be a patriot; under the new dispensation, the religion of a Christian calls him to forswear national prejudices, and to dedicate his love and service, not to any kingdom of earth but to the world-wide Kingdom of Heaven. The true spirit of the Christian (thus they aver) is interpreted in such a saying as that of John Winthrop, the puritan, when in 1630 he prepared for conscience' sake to leave the Old England for the New England in the West: "I shall call *that* my country, where I may most glorify God and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends."

This conviction has features of real impressiveness, and is far from being dumb in argument. It has commended itself with increasing force to a large number of devoted men and women during and since the Great War. It wears an aspect of simplicity and forthrightness which makes it exceedingly attractive to bewildered minds; and it is not without considerable apparent support in the pages of the New Testament itself. Whether

we accept it or disown it as our own conviction must depend on the view we take of the evidence. But we shall neither accept it with intelligence, nor disown it with authority, unless we set ourselves sympathetically to understand it. We shall do well, therefore, to indicate briefly at this point what is to be said in favour of the contention, that so we may reach a conclusion built on all the facts. "Our antagonist," said Burke, "is our helper. An amicable conflict with difficulty obliges us with an intimate acquaintance with our object, and compels us to consider it in all its relations."

(*a*) The first consideration urged by those who would make patriotism an exile from the list of New Testament virtues is the argument from silence. And however precarious the argument from silence is in general understood to be, we can hardly help being arrested and impressed by the almost total omission from the New Testament of any direct commendation of patriotic loyalties. The striking contrast in this particular between the New Testament and the Old may be illustrated by a fact familiar to all the clergy. In any act of patriotic intercession held during war—such as became sadly frequent in recent years—the extreme variety of choice in selecting an Old Testament lesson was only paralleled by the extreme poverty of choice in selecting a lesson from the New Testament. For the stirring of national sentiment, for

the wakening of appeal to the God of battles, for the enforcement of the elemental loyalties which circle round country and kin, the New Testament seemed sadly to seek. "What can you find for your New Testament lesson in a patriotic service," said a friend to the writer, "except the bit about 'honour the king'?" Now, doubtless, much may be said in mitigation of this circumstance from consideration of the historic background of the Gospels and Epistles; and certain points involved in this consideration must be pressed later. But in the meantime the phenomenon confronts us as a significant one. There can assuredly be no appeal against the maxim of Augustine, quoted in the last chapter, that "we do wrong to the New Testament if we put the Old on a level with it."

(*b*) But the argument from silence may be reinforced by another argument, based on facts sufficiently vocal. It has been strenuously urged that the direct explicit teaching of our Lord, specially as summarised in the Sermon on the Mount, not merely ignores patriotism but expressly excludes or negates all its characteristic activities. Mr Robert Blatchford, who, though no Christian, is a fervid patriot and an acute thinker, wrote in the 'Clarion' near the beginning of the war: "We are not a Christian nation. There never has been a Christian nation. There never will be a Christian nation, because any nation which faithfully acted

on Christian principles would cease to *be* a nation. Christian principles bid us love our enemies, pray for them which despitefully use us, turn the left cheek if smitten on the right. They may all be expressed in one phrase, non-resistance." Similarly, Mr Bernard Shaw, in the preface to 'Androcles and the Lion,' uses the following language: "During the war great numbers of ministers should have said quite simply, 'I find in the hour of trial that the Sermon on the Mount is tosh, and that I am not a Christian. I apologise for all the unpatriotic nonsense I have been preaching all these years. Have the goodness to give me a revolver and a commission in a regiment which has for its chaplain a priest of the god Mars, *my* god.'" The fairness of such application of the Sermon on the Mount to corporate life and to national responsibilities may lie open to earnest question. The application itself may rest on a totally mistaken view of the passage. Yet a simple and satisfactory answer may not seem easily come by; and it is not to be wondered at that devout minds, seeking to be responsive both to love of God and love of country, are beset by perplexity. This perplexity is only the reflection in our later day of what must often have been felt by Jesus' own disciples. In an imaginary biography of Simon the Zealot, which cannot in its substance be far from the truth, Bishop Gore says: "Perhaps no harder claim

was ever made upon the heart and mind of a man than was made when [such an eager patriot as] Simon the Zealot was bidden by Jesus Christ steadily to contemplate the irretrievable ruin of his nation and its sacred shrine, and then, instead of bursting into tears and wringing his hands, to be so detached from the anguish of his nation that he could look out with an eager joy for the fulfilment of the purpose of God—the coming of the Kingdom of which the ruin of Israel was but the necessary prelude: 'when these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh—the Kingdom of God is nigh.'" When we are beset by such perplexity as is here depicted, we are apt to be too easily impressed by any unqualified dogmatic utterance like that already quotod from Loisy: "the Gospel knows nothing of patriotism. . . . The Gospel of Jesus implies the non-existence of nationality; it effaces it."

(*c*) Again, it has been passionately contended that the blackest stain on the page of history, the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, was imprinted there by an act of patriotism, and by an act whose character was so typical as to involve the whole instinct in just judgment. It is undeniable that Jesus suffered, because in the eyes of His fellow-countrymen He was too little of a patriot; because He was seemingly indifferent to national interests,

and oblivious of national hopes. Obviously, He did not love His country after the fashion of the majority. He did not act towards it in the manner expected of a claimant to the messiahship. He lifted no finger to deliver it from an alien yoke. He said to the Jewish nationalists of His day that many would come from the East and from the West, and sit down in the Kingdom of God before them. And so to the patriots of the time His teaching was an offence, His ministry a stumbling-block. They raised the cross as a protest against Him. Racial pride led to the final tragedy. In the memorable phrase of the writer to the Hebrews, the cross was the open public "contradiction" of our Lord's ideals of life and truth—and certainly, not least, of His ideals of human brotherhood. If, then—we are ready to declare—patriotism committed the most damnable crime of human history, and committed it in direct virtue of its inherent character, then patriotism stands for ever condemned.

(*d*) It is further maintained that the later books of the New Testament tend to the same conclusion as is thus suggested by the Gospels, and breathe an atmosphere quite as unfavourable to the growth of patriotic sentiment. The apostles themselves were by the nature of the case lifted far above all considerations of nationality. They had no time to be patriots. They were called to

count all things but loss for the sake of their Saviour, and to forsake home and kin to preach the Gospel in all lands. Moreover, the movement which to the apostle Paul was of all others the supreme enemy of the Gospel, the Judaising movement in Christianity, was largely motived by nationalist sentiment; and when we ask what was "the middle wall of partition" between Jew and Gentile, which Christ's cross had to break down, we find the answer in the words "Jewish nationalism." No one can dispute on its own ground the statement of Martensen: "Christianity insists rather on the universal than the national, breaks through national limitations, abolishes the separation between Jews and Samaritans, Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Barbarians, and seeks in all the inner, the immortal man, whose vocation is in that Kingdom which is not of this world."

(*e*) Finally, the fact must not be forgotten that the primitive Church, whose nearness to the New Testament gives to its acts the force of a commentary, agreed to interpret the sacred writings after a fashion rather cosmopolitan than patriotic. Justin Martyr said in the second century, in a passage to which many parallels might be quoted: "We who were once slayers of one another do not now fight against our enemies"; and it has already been remarked that Christians did not enlist in the Roman army till the time of Con-

stantine. The idea of a "just" war, whereon patriots might lawfully ask God's blessing, was unknown in these early days—a fact which shines out the more conspicuously when we find that the Roman missal contains no mass to ask victory of God, or even to thank Him for it. The early martyrs often suffered as guilty of high treason against the State, through refusal to sacrifice to the genius of the Emperor as represented by his statue. Indeed, the Church of Christ was frequently designated in these early years as a τρίτον γένος or Third Race; and persecution constantly bore harder upon Christians, because by no stretch of courtesy could they be given refuge under the status of a "nation."

The question is therefore no merely rhetorical one as to what is to be said about love of country in the memory of New Testament teaching. Is this world-wide sentiment, with whatever heartbreak, to be excluded from the list of virtues in the Christian records? Must we decide that patriotism, with its old elemental loyalties, its ready kindling of emotion, its amazing power as the spring of noble action, is to be banished from the Kingdom of God as at the best an undesirable alien? Must the Scottish Highlander dismiss from his thoughts all memory of the "lone shieling and the misty island," and school himself not even in his dreams to "behold the Hebrides"? Is

it necessary for us as Christians to disown the motive expressed by Robert Burns for many others beside himself, "for puir auld Scotland's sake some useful plan or book to make"? In short, is the love of God in Christ so jealous in its claims, and so absolute in its rule, that it will brook no attempt on the part of love of country to occupy even a courtier's place in the throne-room? Such questions are salutary to the questioner and profitable for the quest. We must at least apply to this subject what John Stuart Mill said more generally: "There is no philosophy possible where fear of consequence is a stronger principle than love of truth."

Now it may help to set these questions in a new perspective, if we pause at this point to suggest an analogy between them and another group of questions of a similar type. If we can show that an apparently tangled skein has a neighbour in another skein of a similar tanglement, while yet the solution of the latter is simple and widely known, then at any rate the end of the thread to be laid hold of may present itself to our view, that we may grasp it and draw out the confusion into order. Let us suppose, then, for a moment that we were dealing not with love of country, but with love of **Family**, and that we were engaged in the inquiry as to what the New Testament has to say about this natural human

instinct. Let it be considered how disconcerting the facts might at first appear. We should turn to the Gospel records, and find Jesus saying to His mother at the very outset of His ministry: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Somewhat later we should read of an earnest request presented to our Lord by His mother and brothers that they might see Him, on an errand whose possible urgency we are not permitted to measure, and we should find Him rejecting the request, and asserting that all who did the will of God sufficed to Him for mother and sisters and brothers. Turning from the life to the teaching of our Lord, we should find such words as these: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. . . . He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Passing from the Gospels to the Book of Acts, we should find that the first disciples forsook home and kindred for the truth's sake, and became wanderers on the earth—each one ready to say:

> "Yet not in solitude if Christ anear me
> Waketh him workers for the great employ,
> Oh not in solitude if souls that hear me
> Catch from my joyaunce the surprise of joy."

Continuing our progress to the Epistles, we should come upon St Paul saying that it was better not

to marry than to marry; and in another place, after describing his own ancestry, declaring that he counted all such family gains as refuse that he might win Christ. Finally, if we thought it good to ask for the commentary of the primitive Church upon these passages, as written in the lives of its members, we should find the early Christians renouncing family ties for the sake of the new faith, turning a deaf ear to the most moving entreaties of their heathen relatives, and, as Tertullian put it, preferring obstinacy to deliverance. How clear it might appear, on the first face of the inquiry, that love of Christ and love of family are not compatible, and that (to parody the words of Loisy already quoted) the "Gospel knows nothing of love of home." Yet a just instinct would warn us that such a contention would be distinctly wide of the truth. It is true that Jesus Christ demands an allegiance to Himself, which gives to family affection a secondary place; and that the annals of Christian heroism would be shorter than they are if this allegiance had not been operative throughout the centuries. Nevertheless, the Gospel has not, in experience, proved itself the foe of the family. The maxim of an old theologian is no less true than beautiful, that "the Christian home is the masterpiece of the Gospel." The fact is, that Christianity has clasped the family so close in its arms as to carry it (in the typical redeeming

experience) through a form of death to resurrection. It has slain the family as an expression of the chief end of man, that it might bring it to life as a lovely and honoured instrument for the accomplishment of the acceptable will of God. Pater had the approval of history when he represented Marius the Epicurean as first attracted to the Christian faith through the embodiment of it in the novel charm of a Christian home.

Now since this purification of family life through the teachings of the Gospel is a well-known fact of experience, it may all the better offer us a starting-point, and suggest to us the right direction for an advance toward the solution of the larger problem. To admit, should the admission turn out to be due, that patriotism as the chief end of man was slain by the sharp sword of Gospel teaching, is by no means to acknowledge that patriotism of every form and quality is "dead and buried, and its sepulchre is with us unto this day." Patriotism may only have been slain, as was its Lord and ours, to pass through death to a richer heritage of life. It may only be conforming to the universal law of Christian perfection, to the life-giving paradox of the Gospel—that of dying to live, falling to rise again, losing the life to save it. There may be two qualities of love of country in the Christian view, as there are two qualities of love of family. There may be a selfish love of

country, rooted in pride, and flowering in pugnacity, with which the teaching of the New Testament can make no terms; while yet there exists as a possible Christian virtue a redeemed love of country, humbly obedient to the faith, and richly serviceable for the glory of God and the good of men. To see whether what thus *may* be really *is*, we must now grapple directly with our problem, and inquire as to the positive elements of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of patriotism.

I.

Let us begin with the **life and example** of Jesus Christ, that we may discover the bearing of these upon the estimate we search for. Is it, in fact, forbidden to us to think or speak of Jesus as a patriot? Does His example rebuke us when we sing in Christian worship of "the land we love the most"? Was the only kingdom in whose welfare we can imagine Him engrossed the world-wide Kingdom of the Heavenly Father?

(*a*) One factor in the answer may be indicated without hesitation. It should be amply evident to the candid reader of the Gospels that Jesus was affectionately conscious of the ties that bound Him to His race, that He may with all reverent boldness be called a patriot, and that though He

did not love mankind the less, He did love His country the more. Proofs lie scattered through the record that the love of our Saviour for the land of promise was none the less tender because it was subordinate to the love of God, and none the less constraining because a still higher constraint held it in check. Can any one doubt the nature or the name of the emotion which prompted the lament over the great might-have-been: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not"? Can any one read the story which tells how, in an hour big with fate, Jesus, "when He was come near, beheld the city and wept over it," without seeing, not merely *an* example, but the supreme example of a patriot's love and tears? And lesser instances multiply in the view. The evangelists cannot have thought they were doing a thing Jesus would Himself have deprecated, when they took pains to trace His genealogy through many centuries, and to show how it was doubly entwined with the history of His people. He Himself was glad to give help in response to a patriotic appeal, when He showed favour to a Roman soldier, of whom it was said by the Jews that he "loveth our nation, and hath built for us a synagogue." He vindicated Himself at one time for healing a woman on the Sabbath, and

at another time for going to be guest with Zacchæus, on the ground that one was a daughter, the other a son of Abraham; and publicans and sinners were endeared to Him because they were the lost sheep of the "house of Israel." When He foretold the judgment of the then leaders of the people, because they had failed to render to the great Husbandman the fruits expected of them, He nevertheless declared that the Husbandman would let out *that same vineyard*—that same entrustment of national life—to others who would render the fruits thereof. He considered it a fitting reward of the faithful service of His apostles, that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. He deliberately fulfilled the messianic prophecy of Zechariah, that the King of Zion would come riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass. He accepted from Nathanael the confession that He was not only the Son of God, but the King of Israel; and though the inscription on the cross was not chosen by Himself—"The King of the Jews"—it has never been judged by the Christian instinct as itself unworthy of the Crucified. Dr Moffatt translates St Mark xv. 2 as follows: "Pilate asked Him, 'Are you the king of the Jews?' He replied, 'Certainly.'"

(*b*) But there is a more sweeping deduction to be drawn from a careful study of the Gospels, which points insistently in the same direction.

It seems to lie plainly on the surface of the records that our Lord began His ministry by offering Himself in all simplicity to the Jewish nation as their own foreordained Messiah, Who was prepared, if His claims were accepted, to lead them *by the originally-designed pathway* to the fulfilment of their national calling. Not otherwise than with absolute good faith and goodwill did our Saviour seek at first to build the new Kingdom on the basis of the old covenant. For many a long day He offered Himself to be the Leader of the Chosen People, who was joyfully ready to accept all that lay in their Nationalism, and to fulfil it, not to destroy. It was for this patriotic, as well as religious end that He sought—

> "By winning words to conquer willing hearts,
> And make persuasion do the work of fear."

He opened His ministry by announcing Himself in the synagogue of Nazareth as the herald of the jubilee foretold by the prophets; and He closed His ministry by the lament that His people had not known the day of their visitation. He delayed to grant the request of the Gentile woman for her daughter on the ground that God had not sent Him to minister to Gentiles, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. He expressly forbade His disciples, when first He sent them forth, to enter into the way of the Gentiles; and with this fact we must deal frankly, and understand that the

Son of David was in all good faith restricting to His own people first of all the national opportunity for which they had been chosen.

Indeed, it is impossible at times to shut out the vision of what might have happened, had this primary appeal of Jesus to the Jewish nation been successful; and though thus to speculate may seem to tread on dangerous ground, it is ground to which His own words more than once invite us. The Saviour speaks as though He had been disappointed; and who then can refrain from conceiving the issue had He *not* been disappointed? Suppose—to look through casements of vision opened by Himself—that when He sought to gather the children of Jerusalem together as a hen her brood, the call had not been slighted; conceive that the barren fig-tree of Jewish nationalism had borne more than mere leaves, when its Creator came looking for fruit; imagine that the elder-brother nation had not been so angry when the prodigals were welcomed home, but had gone in generously to the Father's house to share the welcome; let the dream be cherished that in the hour of the entry into Jerusalem, when many voices cried "Hosanna," and it seemed for the moment that the city of David was about to enthrone great David's greater Son, the welcome had been genuine; suppose, in short, that the Jewish nation had known the day of its visitation

—then what lustre would have rested upon Hebrew nationalism to the end of time, and what loving divine approval upon a patriotism which, seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, had found all other things added to it. How packed with significance would have been the words of the angel, announcing the Saviour's birth: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever."

And if it be objected that in such speculation we have too precarious a foothold, let it be replied that we only look through dream-windows opened by our Lord Himself; and that for many a day He acted as though all these things were possible. The failure of Jewish nationalism was not interpreted by Jesus as due to the fact that it *was* nationalism. Even the condemnation of the Chosen People was cast in this form: "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a *nation* bringing forth the fruits thereof." The failure of Jewish nationalism lay in the fact that, as Jewish, it had become narrow and embittered. Our Lord could no more have commended the arrogant patriotism of His time than Moses could have commended the civilisation of Egypt by the shores of the Red Sea; or foreseen the day, nevertheless in a later hour foretold, when Egypt would "make a third with Israel

and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land." To recognise the historic background of the Gospel is to find many of the difficulties of our subject disappear. Though the clay had been marred in the hand of the Potter, it was still open to the Potter to make *out of the same clay* another vessel, "as seemed good to the Potter to make it."

II.

We may now gird ourselves to come to a reckoning with what is probably the most formidable of all arguments impugning the claim of patriotism to rank as a Christian virtue. This is the argument derived from no less august a source than the direct teaching of Jesus, and especially from those elements in His teaching which are commonly associated with the Sermon on the Mount. The strength of the adverse position here is very obvious. Do not the strong stark words of our Lord concerning, *e.g.*, the non-resistance of evil, forbid all the most characteristic activities of patriotism, as these have been normally exercised in past history? In the eyes of the plain man, patriotism means, and has ever meant, that the patriot is ready to defend his country when it is wrongfully attacked, and that he will forcibly resist disruptive influences threatening it from within. But on the other

hand, the words of Jesus seem at first sight to forbid the use of force as an agent in His Kingdom, and to enjoin non-resistance as the invariable duty of a Christian man. Hence the dictum of Blatchford appears on the surface to carry with it an air of impregnability—that there never has been a Christian nation, and never will be ; because any nation which faithfully acted on Christian principles would cease to *be* a nation. The difficulty, is, of course, an old one, and is reflected in many other incidental problems.

The difficulty is not to be overcome by any evasion of our Lord's teaching, when once we are certain what that teaching is. Precisely through humbler submission to the plain teaching of Jesus Christ does Christian progress become possible. Furthermore, the difficulty cannot be evaded through such a door as that opened by Bernhardi—in the contention that Christianity, while an excellent faith for the individual, was never intended for the use of States. The attempt to codify the moral law under two departments, one for personal the other for national use, and to deal with it as King Solomon did with the babe—" divide the living child in two, and give half to the one and half to the other "—has been thoroughly tested in Europe during recent years, and has issued in such untold misery that the verdict on it is final. The short discussion of the difficulty

which follows will confine itself within narrow limits, and deal only with considerations relevant to the matter in hand.

By far the most illuminating principle which can be brought to bear upon this subject, as well as upon subjects of kindred perplexity, seems to the writer to be the principle embodied in the profound and comprehensive saying of Troeltsch, quoted by von Hügel in his book, 'Eternal Life.' The saying is to this effect, that Christian truth is never to be thought of "as a circle with one centre, but as an ellipse with two focuses." The law, in other words, impressed by the Creator upon the physical universe, has its rights in the moral world also, and determines the shape of many an orbit of doctrine. There are two poles, not one, and "neither of these poles may be completely absent if the Christian outlook is to be maintained."

As the illuminating principle here suggested will often put a clue into the hand of the student to lead him through an otherwise bewildering maze, some illustrations may be offered of its directing power in other cases. One of the most interminable debates of history is that between Individualism and Socialism; and in this debate, rivers of ink have run dry on pages championing one-sidedly one view or the other. But what sane man does not know in the silence of his heart that

there are here two poles, not one, and that neither of these may be completely absent. The economic curve does not form a circle with its centre in Socialism, nor yet a circle with its centre in Individualism, but an ellipse in which individual freedom and social solidarity determine the two focuses. The case is the same in the long and indecisive controversies between Necessity and Free-will; between Calvinism and Arminianism; between the Individualist and Institutional presentation of Christian truth; between evolution as expounded by Darwin in the 'Descent of Man,' and evolution as expounded by Prof. Drummond in the 'Ascent of Man'; and between those "historical" and "apocalyptic" views of the Kingdom of Heaven, which at first seem so irreconcilable. All of these become tractable as subjects of discussion, if we bear in mind that the orbit of truth is fixed not in the delusive simplicity of the circle, but in the richer and more mystical significance of the ellipse with its two focuses—the figure already chosen by the Creator to be "the pattern of things in the heavens." By its doctrine of the Trinity, Christianity has already set a certain multiplicity in the heart of the Absolute, and it is not to be wondered at if a wealthy complexity, rather than a bare unity, characterises the content of many Christian doctrines.

Furthermore, it is to be observed, in a slight

amplification of the useful figure, that in the neighbourhood of one particular focus the curve of an ellipse might bear a fallacious resemblance to that of a circle, and be readily mistaken for it. Only after closer study might the second focus disclose itself, and the true form of the completed curve be seen.[1]

Now with the help of this conception, it is more easy to express what we feel to be the truth about the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. In the complete course of our Lord's teaching there are two focuses, not one. To recognise a second is not to disregard the first. The one focus lies in the region where the sole concern is for the duty of the individual follower of Jesus Christ in the ordering of his personal life; and here the great Teacher—acting on the rule of one thing at a time—speaks to His disciples in words which admit of no misunderstanding, and in tones which, with all their gentleness, brook no denial. The duty may be described as that of *individual self-effacement.* The follower of Christ is called to be like Christ; and where this involves complete surrender of his own will, he is to regard such surrender as a privilege and an opportunity. He

[1] It might be held that a sense of *humour* often finds its opportunity in the quick discerment of a second focus. Consider Mrs Linnet in 'Janet's Repentance': "It's right enough to be speretial, I'm no enemy to that; but I like my potatoes mealy."

is to allow no private interest to edge out of his life the supreme interests of the Kingdom of God. Having found for himself the accessible joy of the beatitudes, he is in the strength of that joy to manifest the lightness of the yoke he wears, and to regard the inevitable assaults of evil as incentives to meekness and to prayer.

But the question is not thus foreclosed as to the existence of a second focus of Christian duty, discoverable in the region where concern is taken for the *corporate* responsibilities of the Christian life. Suppose that the assaults of evil are assaults upon that very Kingdom of righteousness for which the disciple is set in defence. Or suppose that they assail the interests of other disciples entrusted to his care, and not to be forsaken without disloyalty to the right. Obviously the outlook here is different. The duty recognisable in this region may be described as that of the *maintenance of the social order*. There is clear evidence in various parts of the Gospel story, as we shall see, that our Lord recognised the existence of this second focus also, and considered it determinative of the complete orbit of duty. The supreme Teacher, like all great teachers, was content to teach one thing at a time, and to stand sometimes at one point, sometimes at the other, according to the message He had in view.

This conception of the Sermon on the Mount as

indicating one all-important focus in the orbit of Christian duty, while yet the question is not foreclosed as to the existence of another correlative focus, is corroborated by a consideration advanced by Bishop Gore in his suggestive book upon this Passage. After pointing out that the teaching of the Sermon is technically of the kind called "proverbial"—that is, consisting of proverbs or maxims—Dr Gore reminds his readers that it is of the very essence of a proverb to be an incomplete statement; so that it can in general be flatly contradicted by another proverb. In the proverbial teaching of all nations, the precepts "appear to be contradictory, and yet are perfectly intelligible in the guidance they give us." At one pole of the truth, for instance, we find "penny-wise and pound-foolish"; but at a correlative pole, "take care of the pence and the pounds will take care of themselves." Or again, we may contrast "look before you leap" with "nothing venture, nothing have." The maxims are entirely contradictory in set terms, but are entirely reconcilable in experience. Of any problem emerging, we may say "solvitur ambulando."

Now—in order to discover whether there be indeed another focus in the teaching of Jesus, correlative with that in the Sermon on the Mount, but separate from it—let us extend our survey to one or two other passages in the Gospels. On a

page of the same Gospel which records the Sermon we find these words: "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone . . . but if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more . . . and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he shall neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an heathen man and a publican." Here there is no word of simple self-effacement. The teaching has moved on to another pole of truth, where we behold our Lord's deep concern for the welfare of the community. He proclaims that the community has its importance as well as the individual. The very disciple who must forgo his own rights for Christ's sake may be called upon, for Christ's sake, to defend the rights of the organism. Jesus does not counsel acquiescence in wrong, or indifference to corporate injustice.[1] The virtues which (in Mendelian language) were "dominant" in the Sermon on the Mount have here become "recessive." Similarly we must remember that He who said "Judge not," said also, "For judgment am I come into this

[1] Writing to a correspondent at the close of the American Civil War, in whose abstract justice he had been compelled to believe, Richard Cobden candidly avowed that if in 1861 he had been arbiter of the fate of the negro, he would "have refused him freedom at the cost of so much white men's blood and tears." Is not the caustic comment merited, that it is "as if Mr Ready-to-Halt had begged Mr Greatheart and the rest not to attack Giant Slaygood, for fear of effusion of blood"?

world" ; that He who blessed the meek saw himself as One stronger than the strong to cast out an evil power ; that He who pronounced a benediction on the peacemakers, said that Himself had come to send not peace on earth but a sword. Jesus Christ is King of Righteousness and King of Peace ; but the writer to the Hebrews makes a special point of noting that, like Melchizedek, He is *first* King of Righteousness, and *after that* King of Peace. It will be remembered that when our Saviour, during His trial, was Himself smitten on the cheek, though He did not resent the blow, He made a certain protest on behalf of justice : "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil ; but if well, why smitest thou Me"? And, of course, the appeal of St Paul to Cæsar, recorded in the Book of Acts, is well known. "The Sermon on the Mount," says so unprejudiced a witness as Mr Ramsay Macdonald, "is not the whole sum and substance of Christ's life. He also spoke of a generation of vipers, and whipped the money-changers from the temple."

We believe ourselves entitled to conclude as the result of this short review, that there are two poles of duty in the teaching of Jesus and not merely one ; and that it is vain to omit one from our view, or try to force both together to one rebellious centre. We need not aim at a simplicity of exposition greater than that of our Lord Himself—

"enough to acknowledge both, and both revere." It is entirely possible for a devoted follower of Jesus Christ to accept the Sermon on the Mount as in the fullest sense the law of his own personal life, and to confess with shame that Christian history would have been very different had this law been given its rights in the Christian commonwealth; and yet to deny, with complete confidence and with at least a measure of intelligence, that our Lord would have thought for one moment of laying down its maxims as the only code of corporate or national duty.[1] It is a commonplace that the responsibility of a trustee (which is that of a State to its citizens) is of a totally different nature from that of a private person. We should respect a Christian man who, for the sake of loyalty to the Sermon on the Mount, forbore to defend his own just rights in a law-court, and rather "suffered himself to be defrauded." We should earnestly wish that the spirit prompting such action should grow and prevail. But we should in no wise respect the man who, having been left trustee for some orphan children, should

[1] It is to be observed that this position does not coincide with the mischievous error of the "two moralities"—as though there were one morality for the individual and another for the nation. The symbol for this position would be that of two separate circles with two separate centres. The conception of *one* curve determined in its course by two focuses is manifestly different. For the individual and the nation alike there is one curve. And for the individual and the nation alike there are two focuses.

give facile consent to injustice shown to them, and refuse to carry their threatened rights to the arbitrament of righteous law. When St Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, defied Jordan of the Tower, who had deeply wronged two young orphans, he justly encouraged himself in the closing words of the tenth psalm: "To help the fatherless and poor unto their right, that the man of the earth be no more exalted against them."

Thus we pass to the later doctrine of the New Testament, confident that the teaching of Jesus leaves room for an unselfish love of country, and that the example of Jesus confirms us in the ancient loyalties of patriotism—if only it seek first the Kingdom of God.

III.

Turning now to the later books of the New Testament, let us ask what principles bearing on our subject are to be found in apostolic teaching and in apostolic life. What is the duty of a Christian man towards the country which gave him birth, and towards the civil rule under whose protection his life is lived, as that duty was conceived and exemplified by the apostles of our Lord? We shall offer to this question a brief general answer in the first place, and then deal with the special witness of the apostle Paul.

i.

To take first then a rapid general view—the apostles appear to teach the essential sacredness of civil government, and hence the general claim of the State to the loyal support of the Christian citizen. Such a dictum as that of Tolstoi: "If society and the social order continue to exist, no thanks to the magistrate with his severities, but on the contrary in spite of the magistrate,"—such a dictum is in direct contradiction to specific teaching of the New Testament. On the contrary, the ancient "apology" of Tertullian is far more in accordance with apostolic precepts: "As for the Emperor, Christians invoke God, the eternal, the true, the living. They look up with hands outspread, heads bared, and from their hearts, without a form of words, they pray for a long life for the Emperor, an Empire free from alarms, a safe home, brave armies, a faithful senate, and honest people, a quiet world. They do this, for the Empire stands between them and the world's end. Cæsar belongs to the Christians more than to any one, for he is set up by the Christians' God." The justification for such a view of Christian duty emerges very clearly from certain passages in the apostolic writings, which it will be well to set down at this point in full. Familiar one by one, they

are specially instructive when brought together. The translation is that of Dr Moffatt.

"*All nations God has created from a common origin, to dwell all over the earth, fixing their allotted periods and the boundaries of their abodes, meaning them to seek for God.*"—Acts xvii. 26.

"*Every subject must obey the government-authorities, for no authority exists apart from God: the existing authorities have been constituted by God. Hence any one who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition will bring judgment on themselves. Magistrates are no terror to an honest man, though they are to a bad man. If you want to avoid being alarmed at the government-authorities, lead an honest life and you will be commended for it: the magistrate is God's servant for your benefit. But if you do wrong you may well be alarmed: a magistrate does not wield the power of the sword for nothing. He is God's servant for the infliction of divine vengeance upon evil-doers. You must be obedient therefore as a matter of conscience for the same reason as you pay taxes: since magistrates are God's officers, bent upon the maintenance of order and authority. Pay them all their respective dues, tribute to one, taxes to another, respect to this man, honour to that.*"—Rom. xiii. 1-7.

"*I exhort therefore that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in authority,*

that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."—1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

"*Submit for the Lord's sake to any human authority: submit to the emperor as supreme, and to governors as deputed by him for the punishment of wrong-doers and the encouragement of honest people: for it is the will of God that by your honest lives you should silence the ignorant charges of foolish persons. . . . Honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the king.*"—1 Pet. ii. 13-17.

"*The city had twelve gates . . . on the east three gates, on the north three gates, on the south three gates, and on the west three gates . . . and the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it . . . and they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it.*"—Rev. xxi. 12-26.

There can be no mistaking the broad impression which these passages leave upon us of the truth of the principle contended for on earlier pages—that the division of mankind into distinct nations, each with its own government, and its own loyalties, is part of the divine order.[1] And this impression will become still stronger if we ask what *motive* it was which prompted an apostle (in such a passage, *e.g.*, as that quoted from Romans) to interest himself in expounding the duty of a Christian man to his nation. Was there any special peril

[1] See pp. 35-37, 69-73.

in view, which induced the apostle to concern himself with this matter so earnestly? The answer to this question is given by modern scholars with some positiveness. "There can be very little doubt," says Dr A. J. Carlyle, "that St Paul's vindication of the authority of the civil ruler, and the parallel phrases in the first letter of St Peter, were intended to counteract anarchical tendencies in the Christian societies—were intended to counteract an error, which would have destroyed the unity of human life, and set the Christian societies in ruinous opposition to the general order of the world in which they lived. St Paul endeavours to persuade them of their obligation towards the order of the world."

But this is just to say that the apostle was contending against the primitive form of the very view which leads in later days to suspicion of patriotism as a Christian virtue—the view, namely, that a Christian ought to be so occupied with his relation to the Kingdom of God, that he has no time for, nor interest in, the kingdom of his birth. This view the apostles contradict. The Christian faith, indeed, will not identify its fortunes with those of any particular nation, and it will insist upon it that in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian. But nevertheless it is not the will of God that the Christian should shut himself up in a narrow individualism,

indifferent to the national welfare, and oblivious of all the things "we have heard with our ears and our fathers have told us" concerning what God did in their days, in the times of old. The New Testament writers are not atheists in the realm of the "natural," as some later Christians have unconsciously become. To them national life is part of the divine order. "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians"—all are singled out on the day of Pentecost. All have a share in the good news, and a part to take in the spreading of it. All are said to hear, each in his own tongue, the wonderful works of God. So that at last we are not surprised when, in the vision of the New Jerusalem, the seer beholds the nations of them that are saved walking in the light of it; and the kings of the earth—each with his own contribution—bringing their glory and honour into it.

ii.

Dealing now more specifically with the witness of the apostle Paul, the dominant figure in apostolic Christianity, let us note at the outset a peculiarity in the apostle's situation which is probably too often overlooked. This is, that while St Paul reveals in his own personality the elements of a fervid patriotism, he reveals them with this

inevitable cleavage—that he was compelled to be intellectually a patriot of the Roman Empire, emotionally a patriot of the Hebrew nation. There was in his case a troublesome dichotomy between what we have described on previous pages as the "rational" and "emotional" elements in patriotism. He was a member of two commonwealths. The intellectual factor in his patriotism was largely exercised in certain judgments about the Roman Empire; the emotional factor was called into play when he turned to his brethren according to the flesh. He was forced to approve, in the case of Rome, only where there was little call to love; and to love, in the case of his ancestral people, only where approval must be withheld. There is ground for the statement of Bernard Shaw that "Paul was more Jewish than the Jews, more Roman than the Romans, proud both ways." Hence, while, as we have seen in previous chapters, the normal patriot may pour out on one beloved fatherland the treasure of both the rational and the emotional elements in his nature, and while the possibility of doing this constitutes part of the debt to Heaven under which the British patriot feels himself to lie, what was abnormal in the patriotic lot of St Paul is found in precisely the unhappy twofoldness which was temporarily inherent in the situation. The question has been asked as to how it was possible for the same writer

to pen the emotional heartbreak over Israel in Romans ix., and the fiery invective against the same nation in 1 Thess. ii.; but the problem becomes more soluble when we recollect the torturing dichotomy to which we have just referred. We cannot expect a river thus smitten in two streams to run with all the unified force and volume of a single flood; and yet we shall not find it hard to recognise in the life of this great Christian leader the significant elements of genuine patriotism—elements which in our happier day we are privileged to combine.

(1) No unprejudiced student can read the Book of Acts in the light of modern historical interpretation without a strong sense of the real reverence cherished by the apostle Paul for the Roman Empire, and the pride felt by him in his Roman citizenship. To St Paul, the Roman Empire was a divinely-sanctioned organisation, offering much that was of value for Christian development. We never have the impression in studying the apostle's relation to Rome that he is grudgingly conceding a certain secondary importance to the Empire; but rather do we feel that he sees the hand of God in its history, and the will of God in its secure establishment. That God should have permitted this great Empire to come into being, so that its qualities of discipline made it the master of the world, and so that its reign of law was the bulwark

behind which the gentle arts of peace could flourish —this was to St Paul a fact not to be ignored, or reluctantly admitted, but one to be pondered, studied, set in a true perspective. To this apostle, the God of history was not one Being, and the Father of Jesus Christ another. Sir William Ramsay mentions four particulars in which imperial aims extorted Christian approval both in St Paul's day and later, and one of these is expressed by him as "the encouragement of a sense of unity and patriotism within the Empire."

It has, moreover, often been pointed out how St Paul sheltered himself time and again behind the privileges of a Roman citizen, and how he insisted to Claudias Lysias on the rights of a man "free-born." If, in a speech to the Hebrews, he emphasises his Jewish character, and refers to his birth at Tarsus almost as an accident, to the Greek-Roman chief captain he emphasises the Tarsian birth. No one who worthily conceives the apostle's sense of Christian honour, or the spirit in which he declared "I am a debtor to the Gentile," can for a moment doubt the responsibility bound up in the view of his conscience with such racial privilege. Whatever service a patriot can render to his fatherland under the supreme sovereignty of a God of right, St Paul would have regarded as debt of honour to the Empire which offered him opportunity and pro-

tection. Jewish patriots of the narrower type refused to offer prayer "for Cæsar and the Roman people." St Paul has left us in no doubt that his attitude would have been (as Carlyle used to put it) "far other."

(2) But it is when we turn to the racial, and not merely the political aspect of the patriotism of St Paul, that we find the glow of emotional fervour as well as the light of intellectual conviction. No one can deny the existence of a patriotism justly to be called "Christian" who reads the three chapters in the Epistle to the Romans, wherein St Paul presents himself as the apologist of his people, the justifier of the ways of God to men, and wherein he just stops short of offering himself to be the sacrificial victim of his race. The whole passage is a wonderful illustration of how it may be possible for a Christian to fill up the sufferings of Christ. We may almost say that as our Lord saved men by identifying Himself so closely with them that he carried their sin in penitence into the common grave, so St Paul identifies himself with his erring people, and would fain cling to them even to the national doom and beyond it. Yet, in emphasising the emotional strength of the passage, we must not overlook the fact that it has a rational foundation. The whole point is, that *the national vocation of the people has not been finally lost.* It is true that as a nation they

have failed; but it is also true that as a nation they have still their place in the purposes of God. No vague cosmopolitanism, however benevolent, can be regarded as the Christian ideal by a candid reader of these chapters in the Romans. If in reading the earlier books of the New Testament it might sometimes have seemed for the moment as though nationalism was ruled out, we have only to turn to this inspired commentary on the Gospels to find that our deduction was too hasty. These chapters mark the loftiest height to which patriotism has ever carried any of the children of men.

On the whole, then, in closing a brief survey of the teaching of the New Testament, we reach a distinct conclusion, twofold in character. On the one hand, the teaching of the New Testament is quite uncompromising in respect of divine supremacy. No rival can be permitted to share the throne of the Highest. Love of country, like love of family and love of self, must be taught that the claim of God is paramount. If patriotism should ever claim the first place in the human heart, it can only be met on Christian principles, as Jesus met the patriotism of His day, with strenuous and uncompromising opposition. Nevertheless, it is always the way of the Christian revelation to justify the surrender of precious

things which it demands, by giving back the surrendered things clothed with new beauty, and fitted for new service. And there are large tracts of New Testament teaching which foster the assurance that this is so with love of country.

CHAPTER V.

THE DOMESTIC OUTLOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN PATRIOT

"Ev'n then a wish (I mind its power),
A wish that to my latest hour
Shall strongly heave my breast;
That I for poor auld Scotland's sake,
Some usefu' plan or beuk could make,
Or sing a sang at least."

—BURNS.

"In the dimmest north-east distance dawned Gibraltar grand and grey,
'Here and here did England help me: how can I help England?'—say,
Whoso turns, as I, this evening, turn to God to praise and pray,
While Jove's planet rises yonder, silent over Africa."

—BROWNING.

"I appeal to the House of Commons to bring back what my Lord Clarendon called 'the old good-nature of the people of England.' They may build up again the fortunes of the land of England—that land to which we owe our Power and our Freedom; that land which has achieved the union of those two qualities for combining which a Roman Emperor was deified—*Imperium et Libertas.*"—BEACONSFIELD.

"He had supported the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers, saying, 'They must be taught to be citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven by being made citizens of the kingdom of England."—*Life of Bishop King of Lincoln.*

CHAPTER V.

We have tried in previous chapters to justify the use of the phrase "a Christian patriot." We have argued that there is no just cause or impediment prohibiting the union in lawful wedlock of the adjective and the noun. We have aimed at dispelling the suspicion that often broods over the minds of Christian people, that love of country is not a fundamentally religious sentiment, and that it may be forgone without serious loss to practical spirituality. Nay, more than that, we have pled for the conclusion that subordinate in importance only to love of God and love of family is that love of country which nature has planted as an instinct in every normal breast, and which offers an instrument of incomparable strength and temper to noble causes on whose success the welfare of the world depends. It has seemed to us as surely of God's appointment that men should be set as citizens in nations, as that they should be set as "solitary in families."

But if there be force in these contentions, then

the first general duty of a Christian patriot is to assure himself, beyond reach of contradiction, of the validity of the name he bears. Patriotism suffers loss because religious people so little labour to be in earnest with it. They do not think out for themselves the relation between love of country and love of God, or love of neighbour. And part of the mischief lies in this—that irreligious people on the opposing battle-front are in no such hesitancy as to what they believe or why they believe it. The revolutionary propagandist of our day loathes the very name of patriotism, and loathes it for a reason highly intelligent. He knows it to be the inexpugnable foe of his propaganda. He sees plainly that civilisation is at the cross-roads, and that the choice is being presented to mankind as to what scheme of division they will adopt—whether a vertical division of humanity, wherein distinct nations, maintaining their distinctness, shall aim at bringing diverse contributions to a common store; or a horizontal division, wherein upper and lower strata of capital and labour, "reds" and "whites," shall contend in every country, each for its own advantage. The two paths are irreconcilable, and it will be hard to retrace a path once chosen.

The assumption, then, will be made in what follows, that writer and readers have reached a conclusion favourable to the retention of patriotism

on the list of Christian virtues. We agree with Cromwell that it is part of a man's religion to see that his country be well governed; and if this be so, he must *have* a country, and care intensely for its welfare. From this starting-point we set out on a new stage of our journey. Passing from theoretical to more practical aspects of patriotism, we shall consider what in fact are some of the elements in the duty of a Christian patriot towards his own fatherland. Regarding for the moment our own nation as if it stood alone, shutting out from view at this stage the claims of neighbour states and weaker races, we shall study in this chapter what might be termed the domestic activities of Christian patriotism, leaving the wider international activities for another opportunity. Borrowing two phrases from French politics, we may describe our present subject as the patriotic ministry of the Interior; and the correlative subject, to be dealt with later, as the patriotic ministry of the Exterior.

The factors in the duty of a Christian patriot towards his fatherland seem to the writer to fall into two groups. The first group is concerned with the maintenance of the vision of the national *ideal;* the second with the task of translating that ideal into *fact.* The Christian patriot must begin by taking seriously the adjective which qualifies his patriotism; and by endeavouring

from a Christian standpoint to discover the purpose which God had in view in calling his country into being. He must cherish a vision before he endeavours to turn the vision into reality. And he must not be dismayed at the outset if the ideal he thus cherishes have a serious quarrel with the present. A clear perception of the ideal always induces a critical view of the actual. But then, on the other hand, the vision is not given for the mere gratification of the seer; it is to become operative in the fulfilment of a task. "See that thou *make* all things according to the pattern shown thee in the mount," said the voice which spake to the first builder of a house for God. The ideal waits to be realised in the national life of the time.

It is clear, as has just been hinted, that there may be a certain apparent incompatibility between the two activities indicated—that is, between the patriot's maintenance of a worthy ideal, and the patriot's achievement of a possible actual. For, the man who beholds his country in vision, and gazes on what it was meant to be, is manifestly occupying for the moment a standpoint *outside* his country and above it. Whereas, he who is engrossed in the active service of his nation, stands heart and soul *within* the fatherland, and has identified himself with all that belongs to it. It is not always an easy matter to be duly regardful

of both these aspects of duty. Nevertheless, the effort must be made. As Chesterton says in another metaphor, we walk on two feet, and must be content to progress by advancing first one and then the other. To pursue the "task" of patriotism without the corrective influence of the "vision" of the ideal, would be to foster that "contentment with the second best" of which a distinguished Italian statesman has lately said that nothing more pernicious can characterise a nation. On the other hand, to be absorbed in the vision of the ideal without care for the task of translating it into terms of the actual would be to play the ignoble part of a spectator—the most contemptible of all parts in the eyes of a sincere lover of his country. We are not without instances in our own time of men who have become so engrossed in some mystical dream of abstract perfection, that they have merited the scathing rebuke of Canning:

> "A steady patriot-of-the-world alone,
> The friend of every country but his own."

I.

The first duty, then, of a Christian patriot to his own country is to maintain undimmed the vision of the national ideal. This is no small matter, and corresponds to an end which will not

be reached without real effort. On the morning before Bishop Creighton died, he had been discussing with his chaplain a correspondence in the Press on the greatest danger of the coming century. "I have no doubt on the point," said the Bishop; "it is the absence of high ideals." If a man who loves his country, and desires for it that it may live worthy of its vocation, can only keep steadily before his mind the principles on which from a Christian standpoint all national prosperity is surely built, he is thereby offering his fatherland a real service. Ideals are the masters, and not the servants of mankind, as is shown by the fact that men are willing to yield their freedom in living and dying for them. Nothing could be more shallow, as recent events have proved with peculiar emphasis, than to set a chasm between the ideal and the practical, as though the relation between them was dubious or remote, and idealist a term correlative with visionary. Sancho Panza, it has been pointed out, may plume himself on being the most sensible of men, resolutely contemptuous of abstract principles, and the self-constituted saviour of a romantic master; but it is the lot of Sancho Panza to trudge all his days behind Don Quixote, compelled to follow whither the idealist leads, and to shape his life according to formulas not his own. And if this be true, even when the ideals are admittedly fantastic, how much more is it true

when the ideals are harnessed to service, like the soaring canvas of a well-ballasted ship. It must be remembered that clear visions, in the world of spirit, have a property not vouchsafed to them in the world of sense—they are infectious things. When one eye, and then another, catches the gleam, the common witness of what is seen is apt to be of amazing influence.

The proof of this statement is writ large in history. Who can measure the influence of such an ideal for Scotland as Knox saw gleaming before his eyes, when he conceived a schoolmaster skilled in grammar and Latin attached to every church ; a high school in every notable town, and the edifice crowned by the splendid service of the universities ? Who does not feel the reflected splendour of the vision of Savonarola, when he hears the Florentines cry out under the spell of it, " Hail to Jesus Christ our King ? " Who does not recognise the brightness of the vision given to the men of Leyden, when, on being offered the choice between freedom from taxation and a University, they chose the University ? And though the ideals of the Covenanters may seem to us to be inadequate in many of their component parts, we must not forget that through the influence of these ideals, Scotland came perhaps more near to being a dedicated country than any land of which we have record.

It must steadily be kept in view that while such

visions as those of which we have been speaking are of great value to the nation, they are often of great cost to the patriot. In the nature of the case, they tend to shine against a dark background. The most painful stab of apprehension which can pierce a patriot's heart may be the sense of what his country is, when contrasted with the vision of what it ought to be. As conviction of sin normally comes first in individual conversion, and leads to the "regenerating shudder" of repentance, so in national life disappointment and dismay in view of present facts may form the first step to a better future. Here, however, it should be said that the community enjoys an opportunity withheld from the individual; for the community outlives the generation, and thus lies periodically open to the piercing scrutiny of eyes new-born, looking out with new candour on old abuses, and scornfully incredulous of conventional explanations. It has frequently been felt that a wholesome feature of British character is a well-rooted habit of self-criticism; and it has already been pointed out, in studying the Old Testament, that a most valuable asset of Hebrew patriotism was the almost mordant scrutiny applied to the character of successive generations by the long line of the prophets of Israel.

In accordance with the alternate emergence into the foreground of the duty of maintaining a vision,

and the converse duty of translating the vision into reality, there is to be observed a remarkable feature in the history of nations—a feature which may be said to be peculiarly evident in the history of Great Britain. This is the extraordinary ebb and flow in the tide of national progress, which often suggests a national death followed by resurrection, a widespread conviction of sin leading to repentance, a winter of discontent breaking miraculously into spring. What Dr Glover has said of Rome in the early centuries is equally true of our own land: "It is hard to realise that a people's history can be so uneven, that development and retardation can exist at once in so remarkable a degree in the mind of a nation." Just as the mystics reported their hours of dryness succeeding seasons of exaltation, so does the historian trace the moral progress of his fatherland, not in a straight line of uniform ascent, but in a rising and falling curve, with many a depression, while yet with a general uplift. One half-century in our annals has often been almost incredibly unlike another. In one period we find in England an enthusiasm, an exhilaration, a *joie de vivre*, which embody themselves in such phrases as "Merrie England," such claims of fact as that "England is a nest of singing birds," such splendid panegyric as that of Milton in the 'Areopagitica,' such incidental statements as the remark in the memoir of

George Herbert, that Englishmen were at that time distinguished throughout the Continent for two things, their personal beauty and their skill in music. Of another period, a competent historian will tell us in well-considered words that it was "an age destitute of faith and earnestness—an age whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was without insight, and whose public men were without character." And if in spite of all fluctuation, the line of national progress be found to travel upward on the whole, the explanation must be found in the men and women who in the depths cherished a vision of the heights, and in the worst days of national depression set themselves bravely, and with penitent confession, to make the vision come true. "To obtain therefore God's favour," said a patriot of olden days, "the only and most next way is to redress our naughty manners. O England, England, my own native country, for whose prosperity I do not only shed my prayers, but also salt tears, continually to the Lord our God—would God thou mightest be free from the vengeance and plagues of God that are like to fall upon thee, if thou dost not repent, and amend thy sinful living." There is no joyful zest in the form of patriotic service reflected in such a prayer; nevertheless, more than most, such form of service has the reward anticipated by the psalmist: "he that goeth forth

and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing bringing his sheaves with him." We repeat, however, that the maintaining undimmed the vision of the national ideal may well be a costly thing to the lover of his country. It is to run the risk of being held disloyal to the fatherland, at the very moment when most truly loyal to it. It is to be misjudged as hating the thing, which one only loves well enough to wish it better. The poet Gower in the fourteenth century is said to have written of his country's shame with the tears running down his face; but it has been suggestively added that the men who read the poems did not see the tears. Justly has a recent writer declared of Swift at a later era that "the depth of his love for England may be judged from the bitterness of his indictment against her. Nobody who was indifferent to her welfare could have tried her by such a standard, or ever have found her so wanting as did Swift."

> "If they should tell us love is blind,
> And so doth miss
> The faults which they are quick to find,
> I answer this :—
> Envy is blind ; not love whose eyes
> Are purged and clear."

At this point the question may naturally engage our interest as to what in fact *are* the basal principles of national greatness beheld in the vision

of a Christian patriot. When the prophecy of Pentecost is fulfilled, and when, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, young men see visions and old men dream dreams, of what general form will these dreams and visions be?[1] This is to ask, what are the principles on which, from a Christian standpoint, all national prosperity is seen to be inevitably built?

Now, no serious consideration of this question is in our day quite valueless, however little it may succeed in reaching a final answer. For Christendom is at present singularly devoid of a common mind in respect of the embodiment of national ideals. Christian men and women seem never to have reached a common understanding as to what the nature of the Christian order is with regard to national life. There is a gap here in our corporate thinking. Little dubiety exists as to what is the nature of the Christian order in respect of *personal* life; for we see general agreement throughout Christendom as to the essential elements of Christian character in the individual disciple. Similarly there is no dubiety as to the nature of the Christian order in respect of *family* life; and we should expect to find the chief features of an ideal Christian

[1] Bishop Westcott was wont to distinguish between the two parts of the sentence in Acts ii. 17. "You *must* see visions," he said to one of his younger clergy,—"I despair of you if you don't. Visions belong to youth; when you are older you will only dream dreams."

home to be indicated in much the same terms throughout the Christian world. But there seems to be a hiatus in the working scheme of thought operative in Christendom, in respect of a common understanding as to the nature of the Christian order, when that order is embodied in a nation. What, for instance, would be the economic basis of a Christian commonwealth? What principles would be embodied in its political constitution? What primary needs would guide its legislation? It cannot be claimed that modern Christianity offers the clear answer to these questions which an outsider might justly expect. The charge cannot be refuted which is brought by a modern scholar against the Church of our day: "The Church has never thought out in its fulness the kind of nation, of international life, of industry and society that are alone in harmony with faith, hope, and love, and the Christian idea of God. Having no such adequate ideal itself or clear objective at which to aim, it has, of course, failed to capture the world for it." The principles which follow are meagre both in conception and expression; but they disclose an outline which, like that of scaffolding, may indicate the shape of the building to be erected later by expert labour.

i.

One principle which stands out clear in the vision of a Christian patriot is, that the progress of a nation must be estimated in terms of **considered direction**, not in terms of mere rapidity of movement. Bishop Westcott, a pioneer of social study, against whom could lie no charge of obscurantism, was right when, in answer to enthusiasts eloquently referring to "these days of progress," he was wont to inquire, "progress towards what?" His contention was that progress is an advance towards an ideal, and that to estimate the progress we must fix the ideal. It can never again be assumed, as it too readily was before the Great War, that such a word as "progress," or such kindred terms as "civilisation" or "kultur," must necessarily embody a Christian ideal, even before the terms are defined. The most progressive nation in Europe has offered itself as an object-lesson to prove that some forms of advance are best expressed in Scripture language as "running down a steep place into the sea." The only fault of German civilisation, so thorough, so methodical, so sure of itself, was its lack of interest in the moral *whither*. But this lack is now seen to be fatal. "When I was young," said ex-President Wilson, "we used to flatter ourselves that progress inevitably meant peace. Unhappily, we know better now."

The question has recently aroused considerable interest as to whether there is in reality any solid guarantee of what is commonly understood as "progress," to be deduced from the past history of the universe, of mankind, or of national life. After debating this question in a recent Romanes Lecture with ability and ironic detachment, Dean Inge reaches no more comforting conclusion than that "it is safe to predict that we shall go on hoping, though our recent hopes have ended in disappointment." He quotes, as a plausible summary of modern achievement, the dictum of Disraeli, that we have established a society "which has mistaken comfort for civilisation." Nevertheless, it must be held that Christianity as a faith is deeply committed to the view that progress is a gift of God to the human race, whose Creator and Preserver He is. For Christianity has always maintained the vision of an ideal goal towards which humanity is marching. It would be hard to maintain the conception of God as the Father of mankind, or as in any sense the God of history, if the onward march of humanity is to be likened to that of travellers lost on the American prairie, who go round in a weary circle, and find themselves, when darkness falls, beside the ashes of the fire they had lighted in the morning. Jesus and His apostles have undoubtedly a goal in view, and discern the kingdom of heaven as developing

towards it. Furthermore, it may be held that only Christianity, among the world religions, contains within itself the *secret* of effective corporate progress; forasmuch as Christianity alone cares profoundly for social uplift, and cherishes a boundless hope as to the possibilities that are latent in each and all of the children of men. It is at least obvious that there is no guarantee of social progress in Confucianism, with her ideals in the past; or in Buddhism, with her ambition for the extinction of desire; or in Hinduism, with her caste; or in Mohammedanism, with her ominous social record, and her doctrine of the inerrancy of the Koran. Christianity may be said to have a ground for believing in progress, because she is conscious in herself of the vital forces which may achieve it. Only, it is persistently to be kept in mind that a valid hope of progress must have a more solid guarantee than that of David Copperfield: "I continued to walk extremely fast, and to have a general idea that I was getting on." To move with the times is a phrase entirely destitute of moral significance, seeing that in certain ages it has meant moving to destruction on a steadily steepening slope. It is no light undertaking, no mean achievement, to hold this principle steadily in view. Persistence in doing so will never win the meed of popular applause. A democracy may be

as peevish and as tyrannous as any despot, and an advancing democracy does not welcome suspicion as to its "progress."

ii.

A second principle stands obviously in the forefront of the Christian ideal of national life—namely, that the wealth of a country must be measured in terms of **personality.** Whatever may be the final verdict of posterity upon the economic teaching of Ruskin as a whole, his constant insistence upon this point stands eternally to his credit, and the judgment is not likely in our day to be impugned. The Roman poet Ennius, writing two centuries before Christ, anticipated it when he said that the Roman commonwealth stood on ancient character and on men—*moribus antiquis stat res Romana virisque.* If we would form a worthy estimate of the essential greatness of any nation, we must do so in terms of character; and if the question be asked, "What character?" we reply, with a wise statesman of our own time, "the character of the average man." Personality is the most precious thing in the universe, and it is for the perfecting of personality that the ideal State must work. If on the one side of the truth the individual exists for the State, on the other

side of the truth the State exists for the individual. Unless democracy, government by the people, makes itself aristocracy, government by the *best* people, it is foredoomed. The hidden spring of the whole development of Anglo-Saxon history has been found by competent writers in a temperamental appreciation of the worth of the individual; and they have argued that in so far as we have surpassed other nations politically, it is because we have thus believed in the individual, recognised him, encouraged him. It is certainly true that the word of God whereby nations live has often come most effectively, not in the earthquake of revolution, nor in the fire of war, nor in the whirlwind of politics, but in the still small voice spoken to the solitary prophet, and echoed by him. After Cromwell had been a short time with the Parliamentary army, he told Hampden that the cause would never win with the men then in the ranks, and that he must get "men of a spirit." "Even in war," said Napoleon, in words differing from Cromwell's in sound but not in sense, "men are nothing, the man is everything." "Produce persons," said Walt Whitman, "and the rest follows." The possibilities of a man are to be judged by his best moments, and the possibilities of a nation by its best men.

iii.

A third principle of national policy discernible in the vision of a Christian patriot is one whose statement may not command the same general assent. But it seems to the writer that if History be indeed Philosophy teaching by examples, and if it furnishes in its winding course a revelation of the will of God, this principle will be difficult to refute. It is, that wherever in the story of a nation there comes a point—as come there will—where Liberty and Order engage in a final struggle for the mastery; where tension seems to come to a breaking-point as between some new demand for freedom, and some old insistence on security; then the true course is indicated by God's providential rule of the world—namely, to grant freedom and take the risks.

II.

We turn to what will be generally regarded as the most simple and characteristic element in the duty of a patriot—hearty identification of himself with the interests of his fatherland, so far as these are "according to the pattern shown in the mount" of Christian vision. To see with the eye of solitude the vision of a noble commonwealth, and have no

care for the task of translating the vision into fact, would be in the last degree contemptible.

> "The common problem, yours, mine, everyone's,
> Is—not to fancy what were fair in life
> Provided it could be—but finding first
> What may be, then find how to make it fair
> Up to our means ; a very different thing."

We shall most easily deal with this aspect of patriotic duty by using the analysis given in the first chapter, and by considering how the patriot may best dedicate to the fatherland his threefold endowment of intelligence, emotion, and will. While few patriots can emulate a Savonarola in the measure in which he is said to have displayed in the service of Florence "the prophetic mind, the hero's heart, the martyr's fate," still the three basal faculties suggested in these clauses have all their part in normal patriotism. The patriot must think of his country intelligently, love it ardently, serve it manfully.

i.

The first element, then, in the patriot's task is to bring **intelligence** into play, and to consider how love for his country may best be permeated with understanding. We do not wish to love our country without knowing why we love it. Devotion need not be blind. Under favour of Provi-

dence, our land has been entrusted in the past with various endowments of body, mind, and spirit, which have tended to fit us for our peculiar place among the nations, to differentiate us in a wholesome way from others, and to constitute us stewards of the divine bounty. We shall clearly have a strong link between intelligence and patriotism if we can form some general idea of what these endowments are, and of what may be expected of them in the future, as determining a national contribution to the joint stock of human good. It is a good and pleasant thing that an Englishman should on occasion sing "Rule Britannia," or enjoy without reflection the thrill produced by the casual glimpse of a Union Jack in a foreign land; and there are hours when no profounder stirring of the nature is in season. But the question cannot be permanently shut out as to whether Britain's rule has had any special quality in the past to awaken respect for it; and whether the flag of the Three Crosses has any feature beyond its beautiful symbolism to call forth the gratitude and loyalty of those over whom it flies. It need not be a vain, it may be a profitable thing to appraise our national heritage, and to inquire what peculiar contribution Britain brings to the commonwealth of mankind.

It is true that this investigation is not altogether an easy one, nor is it one often embarked upon. If

it be difficult, as Burke declared, to bring an indictment against a whole nation, it appears almost equally difficult adequately to characterise one. A composite photograph is always blurred. Moreover, the Briton has an instinctive dislike to being explanatory in his patriotism; he shows to the world an easy content with the surface values of things, and if asked to give a considered reason for the patriotic faith that is in him, is apt to take refuge in a silence that is partly deliberate and partly enforced. Nevertheless, such reticence may be carried too far. Patriotism need not be stricken dumb in the court of equity when her case is called. We cannot have attained the position we hold to-day as a nation without some purpose in the Destiny that shapes our ends. And we are not over-introspective if we seek to be aware of the national type, and to reach some understanding of the nature of the trusteeship for which as a nation we must give account, as "good stewards of the manifold grace of God."

(*a*) If, then, with proper diffidence, we institute a brief inquiry as to the specific qualities of the British contribution to human good—the differentiating features of British character and temperament in the past, which have made our race of value to world-order and world-progress—we cannot overlook the fact that a certain **physical endowment** must be assumed as the basis of achieve-

ment. As the outcome, partly of heredity, partly of environment, there has become apparent in bygone years a certain toughness in the British physical frame, which has laid the first course for the addition of higher attributes. A well-known passage in Macaulay's history speaks of the English victories of the Middle Ages—victories such as that of Cressy—as being attributable to the personal superiority of the victors, and describes this superiority as being most striking in the lower ranks. "The knights of England found worthy rivals in the knights of France. Chandos encountered an equal foe in Du Guesclin. But France had no infantry that dared to face the English bows and bills." Manifestly, there must have been some physical basis for the fact thus signalised. Man for man, the Englishman must have shown himself stronger, tougher than his rival; or, in a comprehensive sense of the word, "better bred." He must have shown signs of what Pitt called in a later day "the fortitude which belongs to the national character." Six centuries later, in the throes of the most gigantic armed struggle of history, no consciousness seemed more inexpugnable in British soldiers than that of being man for man better than their foes, formidable as these foes were. "They have more guns than we have; but man for man we can beat them"—how often, in the earlier stages of the conflict,

did one hear this testimony from one of our fighting men, given not boastfully, but as a casual statement of fact. There is no food here, be it remembered, for national vainglory; for, while the men of Cressy were apparently representative of the whole population, the soldiers of the twentieth century were picked from a crowd which showed nearly a million other men unfit for military service, and extorted the warning from the Prime Minister of the day, "You cannot build an A1 empire out of C3 people." The British strain at its best is still capable of magnificent physical achievement; but no strain of human lineage has in the past been proof against the corroding of luxury, the malignancy of vice, or persistent disregard of laws of national health.

(*b*) As pertaining to the border-line between the physical capacity just considered and higher moral accomplishment, we may refer here to a second British characteristic, which has markedly contributed to the sum of human variety, and has also contributed in no small degree to the extension of the British Empire. We mean, the national **fondness for exploration**, with its associated love of adventure, and the passion (*absit omen*) for "going to and fro in the earth, and for walking up and down in it." "Wherever we go over all the earth," says Newman in a characteristic passage, "it is the solitary Englishman, the London

agent, the explorer, who is walking restlessly about, abusing the natives and raising a colossus, or setting the Thames on fire in the East or in the West. He is on the top of the Andes, or in a diving-bell in the Pacific, or taking notes at Timbuctoo, or grubbing at the pyramids, or scouring over the Pampas, or acting as prime minister to the King of Dahomey, or smoking the pipe of friendship with Red Indians, or hutting at the Pole. His country and the government have the gain; but it is he who is the instrument of it, not organisation, systematic plan, authoritative acts." It is in accordance with this characteristic that Gordon should have been able to say so truly that the British Empire was founded on the adventurer. The traditional battle attack of British infantry in open order, contrasted with the adoption by other armies of the method of close formation, is not without the force of a parable when applied to the national advance on more peaceful fields. While other nations have won their empires by massed attack, and have annexed this or that adjacent mass of territory, Great Britain has won wider dominions by an advance in open order. Let us again call to our help the descriptive power of Newman depicting the unofficial action of Clive at a turning-point of Indian history: "Suddenly a youth, the castaway of his family, half-clerk, half-soldier, puts himself at the head of a

few troops, defends posts, gains battles, and ends in founding a mighty empire over the graves of Mahmood and Aurungzeb." The islander naturally tends to be a rover, and if we have been right in saying that there is something tough and unyielding about the British physical constitution so that it maintains itself in any climate, we are also justified in ascribing to it properties of elasticity and adaptability, so that it makes itself at home over all the world. This trait—half-physical, half-ethical—is important, because it lies near the root of success in colonisation ; and because, when dedicated to the noblest of all adventures in the furtherance of the Kingdom of God, it has led to the supreme achievements of the men who have hazarded their lives for the spread of the Gospel —a Livingstone, a Williams, a Hannington, a Grenfell.

(*c*) A still higher constituent of typical British character, when that character is taken at its best, is what no less an authority than the Austrian Chancellor called in a very recent appeal to our nation our "traditional sense of justice." It may fairly be claimed that an instinct for fair play, an honest desire to give his rights to the "other man," has been characteristic of the British attitude to fellow-mortals in the most typical representatives of our race. A writer so old as Montesquieu says that whenever England is the centre

of negotiations in Europe, she brings to them a little more honesty and good faith than do the others. Hence even in a disputed matter the average Englishman will often think it right to make an effort to cross mentally the boundary line of the dispute, and to look at the quarrel from the opponent's point of view. Upon preparedness to do this, and upon some measure of success in doing it, the just settlement of personal and industrial strife must often depend.

An illustration of this trait may be adduced from the life of Bishop Westcott of Durham—an incident which, standing as it does to the credit of the bishop, stands no less to the credit of the other parties concerned. During a prolonged coal strike in the county of Durham, the bishop offered to act as intermediary between the disputants; and when his offer was accepted, invited representatives of masters and men to his palace. Staking his faith upon their temperamental sense of justice, he addressed the two parties separately in similar terms. To the masters in one room he said, "I am not fully conversant with the merits of this dispute, but this one thing I know—that everything of success in this conference depends upon your trying to see this conflict *from the point of view of the men.* I shall leave you for an hour, and come back for the best terms you are prepared to yield me." To the men in another room, the

bishop spoke the same words with the necessary transformation: "everything depends upon your trying to see this conflict *from the point of view of the masters.*" Then he left the two conferring bodies, and retired to his chapel for prayer. After an hour he returned, and, receiving the masters' terms, submitted them to the men, and *vice versa*, only to find that at that stage they were irreconcilable. But without dismay, he repeated his injunction a second time, especially bidding each body regard the situation from the view-point of the other. And when at the close of the second period the bishop returned for the two sets of terms, he found them so nearly identical that a very brief adjustment removed the last discrepancy. If it is obvious that few mediators would have possessed in so rich a degree the confidence of the contending parties, the statement is perhaps equally warranted that in few other countries would such mediation have found the temperamental presuppositions which enabled it to be effective.[1]

In pleasant harmony with what may be affirmed of the British instinct of justice is the currency of the proverb in many parts of the world—"as sure as the word of an Englishman." "These

[1] The incident is told in these terms in one of the official publications of the Church of England published during the "National Mission." Reference to the 'Life' of Dr Wescott confirms the essential facts, though the statement of them is there less concentrated.

barbarians have a curious habit of always speaking the truth," said a courtier once to an Emperor of China. To the typical Britisher, approximating to his best, the first elementary demand of justice is the communication of truth ; and this demand of truth is peculiarly inexorable when a promise has been given to comrade or dependent. To give a promise to another whereon dependence has been placed, and then to lapse from the pledge ; to be trusted and betray the trust ; to "let a man down"—such sentences express the crowning treachery of which a Briton can conceive himself guilty. Hence the confidence which men of lower civilisations and weaker races have often felt in British good faith. In Nigeria, when war broke out in 1914, the chiefs were in possession of some 350 "scraps of paper," guaranteeing on behalf of Britain certain rights and privileges. Not a single British regiment, however, was on the spot to represent the majesty of empire, and only a few British officers in command of native soldiers. There were German troops in the neighbourhood, and efforts were made to shake Nigerian loyalty, especially by an offer to restore the lucrative slave trade which Britain had abolished. These efforts met with no success whatever. General Lugard reported "innumerable expressions of loyalty" from the chiefs, and numerous offers of assistance in the war. When for reasons of policy personal

assistance was refused, the Nigerian chiefs and people voluntarily contributed £38,000 towards the expenses of the conflict.

It is by no means fanciful to see a connection between the love of justice of which we are here speaking, and the British passion for sports and games. The very phrase "fair play" points to this connection. The British habit of thinking of war, and even of life itself, as a kind of superior game has often been commented upon, and sometimes with an accent of half-contemptuous impatience. "To interest a Frenchman in a boxing match," says a writer who is himself a Frenchman, "you must tell him that his national honour is at stake. To interest an Englishman in a war, you need only suggest that it is a kind of boxing match." But it is to be observed that a boxing match, when fairly conducted, has certain features whose implications stretch beyond the occasion. It demands rules, carefully and impartially framed. It suggests an umpire with power to enforce the rules. It implies a watching background of spectators conversant with the rules, and intolerant of any breach of them. Obviously, if a soldier can think of war under these terms, he thinks of it under terms which make a strong appeal to his sense of fair play, and at the same time to the manlier and more strenuous side of his nature. The conception does not mean that war is trivial,

like a game. It means that war, like a game, is truly an affair of honour. The man who in the schoolboy idiom "plays the game," or in soldier slang behaves "like a sportsman," is descended in lineal moral succession from the runner in the old Greek sports, whose ambition was not merely to reach the goal ahead of others, but to reach it with the lighted torch still unquenched.

(*d*) The most important contribution which Britain has so far brought to the joint stock of human wellbeing seems to the writer to be that reserved for final mention—a balance attained by no other nation between **love of liberty and love of law.** The auspicious union between order and freedom has presented itself to many observers as the main feature of our national history, in so far as that history is matter of legitimate pride. "Other societies," says Macaulay, "possess constitutions more symmetrical than ours. But no other society has yet succeeded in uniting revolution with prescription, progress with stability, the energy of youth with the majesty of immemorial antiquity." Palmerston found the spring of his buoyant optimism in the reflection that "this country has shown that liberty is compatible with order, that individual freedom is reconcilable with obedience to the law." And a more recent writer of expert knowledge, Mr Ramsay Muir, after speaking of how in ancient times Greece stood for

liberty, and Rome established our idea of law, and after tracing the development of these often conflicting principles, goes on to say: "But there was one happy land where even amid the turbulence of the Middle Age, both Law and Liberty in a more generous sense got themselves established. This happy land was England—the first of European nations to achieve full consciousness of her nationhood. This happy nation was to be, in the third and greatest age of Western civilisation, the main guardian and representative of the most fundamental ideas of that civilisation, though neither she nor her rivals were yet able to perceive this." Certainly, when we think of the nations geographically nearest to us, and of how in France, during the Revolution, the extreme of liberty ran unchecked into licence; and of how, in Germany, in a later period, the extreme of law was embodied in the autocratic discipline of the drill-sergeant, we cannot but be grateful to God for what he has permitted our country to know of the harmonious co-operation of the two, and cannot but be mindful of the scriptural precept, "hold that fast which thou hast."

ii.

We have dealt with the point that when a Christian patriot dedicates his powers to the service of his country, the first power he should seek to

enlist is intelligence. He ought to have an intelligent apprehension of the probable purpose of God in securing for his particular country a distinct place among the nations; and he ought to argue that, if God have indeed written one line of His thought upon each people, it is desirable that each citizen should know what that thought is. But we have now to remind ourselves that man is much more than a merely rational creature, and that **emotion** must stand alongside of reason in patriotic service. Blind would the Christian patriot be to patent facts of life and to recent teachings of psychology, if he did not recognise the importance in history of that upsurging rush of feeling which proves itself so often the most potent instrument of social reform. The Christian patriot ought not to slight the value of disciplined emotion as an ingredient of his own character; and still less ought he to slight it as a necessary factor in the education of the young. The central thesis of one of the most notable books of the last decade, Benjamin Kidd's 'Science of Power,' is that the future of civilisation rests not on reason but on emotion; and that the "emotion of the ideal" is the most effective weapon known to history for the bringing in of a new era. Mr Kidd illustrates this thesis by reference to the astonishing change, in this case malign, which came over Germany in a single generation under the impulse

of ideals of national conquest presented emotionally in her schools and colleges. And he also adduces the more praiseworthy transformation of Japan under ideals similarly commended to her youth. No reader of Mazzini's speeches addressed to the men of Italy can doubt the almost irresistible power of strong emotion evoked by a national ideal clearly seen and adequately presented. Unhappily, the activities of Sinn Fein in Ireland offer at the moment of writing another and less welcome instance of the same astonishing power. One is led to feel that if good men could only cherish emotions of goodwill as evil men have often cherished emotions of hatred; if citizens could only find an emotional "equivalent of war," and not merely a "moral" one; the prayer would not so often be belated—

> "O God, had we but loved enough
> Our sea-girt land *in peace.*"

(1) It may be possible to indicate a little more precisely what is implied in the cultivation of patriotism as an emotion. Defined as love of country, it directs the most unselfish of all feelings to one of the most comprehensive of objects. Hence the Christian patriot ought to love his country **deliberately.** It is true that there is nothing more difficult or more delicate than the express culture of feeling; and that we cannot

love because we will, and when we will, even when it is our country which invites our love. Emotion seems to dwindle when direct attention is fixed upon it; and the saying is true that you cannot educate a rose to smell sweet by any process directed expressly to its scent. Nevertheless, emotion springs quickly to life under certain conditions. There is a Buddhist saying that our lives follow our thoughts as the wheel the foot of the ox that draws the cart. This saying is specially true of the relationship between intelligence and feeling. When intelligence is afoot in some new dawn of apprehension and has set out upon her march, emotions which were slumbering by the camp-fire will be roused and constrained to follow. Patriotism as a conviction will draw after it patriotism as an affection. Hence we ought to think deliberately at times of the debt we owe our country. "I would have you," said Pericles, "day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of Athens, until you become filled with the love of her." However difficult it may be to define a nation in the abstract, at all events our own nation is for ourselves a concrete reality. It has been many centuries in the fashioning, and has become "the old country" in all significancies—grey in the bringing forth and nourishing of many children. Not without the respect of others, and the general esteem of mankind, have grey hairs appeared here and

there on the brow of the motherland. To her, also, a "hoary head is a crown of glory," and come what may in the future, she must needs have an illustrious and honoured name till human history has an end. It is only through our inheritance in our country that we are heirs of the past, and it must be chiefly through our country that we can be benefactors of the future. We can as a rule do little for humanity by our individual effort; but our country can do much for it, and we can help to make our country worthy of the task.

(2) Furthermore, the Christian patriot must needs love his country **reverently.** The more we ponder in Britain the record of God's dealings with our fathers, the more are we constrained to say, *Non nobis, Domine*, and the more shall we be concerned to pray to the God of our fathers, that He will indeed "be the God of their succeeding race." There has been entrusted to us in our island-home the best-defined territory in Europe. No question can arise as to whether the boundaries are rightly drawn; we are bounded by the sea. No new-drawn maps can vex us, as they have vexed other nations, traced by the ignorant or arrogant hands of conferring statesmen. Providence has given us our place on the map, which no power on earth can alter. In other lands, problems arise as to boundaries; in our land, none. Within this boundary, the same language is spoken and understood;

and a certain wealth of dialect but adds to the richness of the treasure. When we consider, therefore, the heritage which has become ours through the unmerited goodness of God, shown first to our forefathers and then to ourselves, we cannot but realise the marvel of the divine confidence which has been placed in us, and cannot but shudder at the possibility of its betrayal. "Lord, Thou hast been favourable unto thy land . . . show us Thy mercy and grant us Thy salvation."

(3) The Christian patriot is called, almost above all, to love his country **hopefully.** A besetting sin of Christendom in the past has been to be far too little hopeful of what, under proper conditions, one generation can accomplish. One of the sentences which Benjamin Kidd put in italicised headlines in the book already quoted is this: "Given clear vision in the general mind, this cultural inheritance (of goodwill) could be imposed on civilisation in a single generation." And there is nothing more certain, as a matter of historical observation, than that the temper and outlook of a nation may be revolutionised in a very short space of time. Nations lie just as open to conversion as individuals, though the word may be used in a somewhat different sense. Of whatever other treasures Pandora's box may be empty, it need not, when in Christian keeping, be empty of its primeval gift of Hope.

It should be remembered that the Christian has in the apostolic doctrine of the Holy Spirit a special incentive to hope. The Christian is invited to believe in men, because he believes in the potencies of the grace of God *in* men. The just criticism was once passed on Carlyle that while he had indubitably one qualification of a prophet in that he sincerely believed in his message, he lacked another qualification in this, that he never could persuade himself that his message would be *accepted*. He flung his teaching at "forty millions, mostly fools," and hence the impression the teaching often carried of something petulant, splenetic, ill-humoured. On the other hand, the remarkable influence over men of one of the greatest of modern English Churchmen (and the writer has heard the same explanation given of the influence of Dr Charteris in the Scottish Church) has been ascribed to the fact that his speeches and writings always contrived to suggest the conviction that men only wanted to know their duty in order to discharge it. He had faith not only in his message, but in those to whom he declared it. This is indeed the only position consistent with Christian orthodoxy. If we cherish a devout belief in God as Father, and a genuine reliance upon the Son of God as our Redeemer, we must not withhold belief in the power of the Holy Spirit to persuade and enable men to respond to the declaration of the divine

will. But the Holy Spirit is given in answer to prayer, and this naturally leads us to our next point.

iii.

Our final point in this chapter concerns the dedication of will to patriotic service. And there is one form of this dedication which is so congruous with Christian belief, and which lies so immediately within the reach of every Christian patriot, that it may stand here as the representative of all the rest. This is such dedication of time, strength, and vitality to the service of the fatherland as is involved in deliberate obedience to the command of the apostle: "I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." "Intercession," says William Law, "is the ancient fellowship of Christians." From whatever other service a patriot may be withheld through lack of strength or opportunity, it is always open to him to fall back upon the resolve—

> "And for mine own poor part,
> Look you, I'll go pray."

It has been suggestively said that prayer is an easy lesson, hard to learn. It is in one sense an easy lesson, because it is for most men an instinct

rather than an acquirement. "We hear," said William James, "a great deal of discussion about the efficacy of prayer, and many reasons are given us why we should not pray, whilst others are given us why we should. But in all this very little is said of the reason why we do pray. The reason why we do pray is simply that we cannot help praying." Yet on the other hand, this easy lesson is in another sense hard to learn. One of the main maladies of our age is that we so sadly fail to embody in the organised habits of daily living the creed of our noblest instincts. It is one thing to believe in prayer, another thing to believe in praying.

(1) It is by prayer that the Christian patriot will best acknowledge **dependence** upon God, and win an answer to the petition offered on his deathbed by Oliver Cromwell: "Teach those who look too much upon Thy instruments to depend more upon Thyself." When we look at the problems which emerge round the horizon of any national survey, when we think of the leadership needed to engage them, the qualities of heart and head needed to surmount them, each Christian citizen must say with the psalmist, "My soul, wait thou only upon God, for my expectation is from Him." We seriously need in those days some check upon our natural turning to material and intellectual forces —the wisdom of statesmen, the muster-roll of

armies, the pay-bill of industry, the suggestions of conferring councillors. *Nisi Dominus frustra.* Every one who prays, in however humble a sphere, and uses the opportunity of prayer to acknowledge his own dependence on God, and the dependence of his fellows, is doing something to liberate the strength that is made perfect in weakness, and to make national life a rallying-ground for the forces of heaven.

(2) It is by prayer that the Christian patriot will awaken and exercise his **hope** in God—that hope of which we spoke a few pages back as being characteristic of Christian insight. It is a special office of our Redeemer to take away heaviness of spirit in religious duty, and to give instead thereof the "garment of praise." Normally, it is a real pleasure to a healthy man to embark upon a task which he feels to be thoroughly worth while. Joy in work which promises achievement, however strenuous that work may be, is one of the most pervasive and deep-seated joys in human nature. And perhaps the message about prayer which our age needs most of all is that for the least conspicuous disciple this "labour is not in vain in the Lord." To turn to the teaching of Jesus on the subject is to recognise the too frequent chasm between His view of the matter and the view most prevalent in our time. Where we speak of the problems of prayer, He spoke of its achievements.

Where we explain its limitations, He dwelt on its possibilities. Where we present the matter in terms of apologetic, He presented it in terms of Gospel. Hence no Christian patriot will readily become a pessimist. He may be perplexed, yet not in despair; troubled, yet not distressed. He will seek by prayer to give a nobler application to the words of Shelley—

> "To love, to bear, to hope, till hope creates
> From its own wreck the thing it contemplates."

(3) Finally, it is by prayer that the Christian patriot will find the appointed gateway to **active service**, seeing that the essence of prayer is fellowship, and fellowship implies the practical carrying out of the divine purpose, the being "fellow-labourers" with God. It is the saying of an old theologian that God can as little do without us as we without Him. Rightly interpreted, the statement is just. The King of Nations has chosen thus to limit Himself. There are apparently certain gifts He will not give, and certain loving designs He cannot bring to pass, except as His call to human partnership finds a willing response in the prayers and the service of men. The saying of Coleridge is true, both in what it directly asserts and in what it ultimately involves: "The act of praying is the very highest energy of which the human mind is capable."

CHAPTER VI.

THE INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK OF CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM

"And our own good pride shall teach us
To praise our comrades' pride."

—KIPLING.

"The great lesson of the world-war is, that not in separate ambitions or in thoughtless domination, but in common service for the great human causes, lies the true path of national progress."—SMUTS.

"Wherever in the world a high aspiration was entertained or a noble blow was struck, it was to England that the eyes of the oppressed were always turned—to this favourite, this darling home of so much privilege and so much happiness, where the people who had built up a noble edifice for themselves would, it was well known, be ready to do what in them lay to secure the benefit of the same inestimable boon for others."—GLADSTONE.

"We have, with whatever mistakes and misunderstandings, striven to raise our subjects to a higher type of life. . . . We may have learned our lesson slowly, but we have learned, and are learning still, that the sign of Empire for nations, as for men, is not self-assertion but self-sacrifice."—WESTCOTT.

"God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause his face to shine upon us: *that thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations.*"—PSALM lxvii. 1, 2.

CHAPTER VI.

The subject to be dealt with in this chapter is the necessary complement and correlative of that last considered. It is not enough that a Christian patriot should be alive to his duty towards his own country: he lies also under obligation to the world of his fellow-men. There is a saying of Disraeli, dating from his earlier life, that his politics "were comprised in one word—England." It is our business at this stage to join issue with that statement, if taken as the serious or exhaustive expression of the final ideals of a Christian patriot. No nation stands alone, or exists independently of the larger life of the race. As the individual is only one factor in the life of the nation, so the nation is only one factor in the life of humanity. And as the individual is called to cherish his own personality that he may dedicate it to the good of the nation, so the nation is called to cherish the national genius that it may be dedicated to the good of mankind. It may be held, indeed, that it is precisely here that we reach what is at

once the supreme obligation of Christian patriotism, and the critical test of its validity. The pattern-prayer of the Christian patriot is embodied in words which we cannot quote too often—

> "Lord, bless and pity us,
> Shine on us with thy face;
> That th' earth thy way, and nations all,
> May know thy saving grace."

According as the purpose of the last two lines is sincere, so is the prayer of the first two lines acceptable. God is no respecter of persons. The final goal of history—revealed to us in the apostolic forecast—"that in all things Jesus Christ may have the pre-eminence"—rises high above the prosperity of any nation or continent. In the vision of the New Jerusalem at the close of the New Testament, there is seen, as Westcott taught his generation, distinctness of national life and unconfused separateness of national service; but these are beheld as harmoniously dedicated to the corporate perfection of the city of God—"the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it."

It is only within the last short period of secular history that the vision has broken upon mankind of a patriotism as truly dedicated to the good of humanity at large, as it is concerned with the welfare of a particular nation. How compara-

tively recent this vision is, at any rate in British history, will appear in the course of the next few pages. And yet the vision is a true one, and open to many eyes, in many lands. Its conception marks perhaps the greatest moral gain, at least in the region of social ethics, that has come to the world in a hundred years. It is pre-eminently *the* "heavenly vision" of our time, whereto disobedience would mark the great refusal. In olden days, in Scotland, part of an estate was sometimes deliberately given up to weeds and briars and desolation, under the name of the "Goodman's croft." It was hoped that Satan, whose interest in the property was thus politely recognised, would be content with the sphere allotted to him, and show the spirit of reciprocity by leaving the rest in peace. Too often the domain of foreign relationships even in Christian countries has been a Goodman's croft. The spirit of selfishness has been invited to guide the policy in the ministry of the Exterior; and only for the ministry of the Interior has the spirit of service or sacrifice been thought appropriate. Hence the unhappy paradox that while, on the internal side, nationalism stands for what is almost pure good, on the external side it has been identified so largely with the spirit of rivalry and ill-will. But in our day of opportunity the finger of God's providence is beckoning the world to better things. Just as family loyalty

involves no tincture of hatred to other families, so a pure patriotism has nothing to do with hatred of other nations. The law of service has already in Christendom declared its just sway over the individual and the family, and in these realms has won striking and permanent victories. It seems now to be putting forth a supreme (shall we say a final ?) effort, and to be claiming as its sphere "the largest natural grouping of men, in which they have as yet been able to feel and act together"—*i.e.*, the nation. If the law of mutual service fails to secure the allegiance of the nations to-day and to play a large part in the shaping of their policies, then it would seem that certain disaster must for the time overtake humanity. On the other hand, if the dedication of patriotism to a law of brotherhood can be achieved, the world will have taken the longest step in its onward progress that recent centuries have seen.

If such harnessing of patriotism to a world-wide obligation should seem fantastic to any reader and bound up with ideals too high for human reach, the suggestion may be offered that a study of history may correct or modify this impression. No more interesting, and at the same time no more cheering, task could be suggested to the student of British history than to trace the stream of patriotic ardour running through our annals, and to mark not only its deepening intelligence

and its broadening sympathy, but also its increased sense of a goal of **stewardship** to which it flows. When Ezekiel beheld the great vision of the river of life flowing from under the threshold of the temple and wending its way eastward to the Dead Sea, his first impression was simply that of the growing *magnitude* of the river, as the waters grew from ankle-deep to knee-deep, from knee-deep to loin-deep, from loin-deep to "waters to swim in." But this first impression was superseded later on by a still more enthralling one—the amazed recognition of the *direction* in which the river flowed, so that "the waters issue towards the east country, and go down into the desert—and being brought forth into the Dead Sea, the waters shall be healed." Some such sense of a directed purpose in British patriotism breaks upon the student of its history, and makes that history sacred in his sight. He becomes aware of far more than a growing volume in the stream or a deepening power of expression. He becomes conscious that, with many a winding, many a temporary retardation, the current of British patriotism has set on the whole towards a world-wide service undreamed of at the first, and towards a sense of vocation most nobly expressed by our noblest statesmen. There is now a *tradition* behind our British patriotism, the deposit of long centuries of its history; and that is the tradition—to use the words of a states-

man of our own day — "of serving the world, and influencing the destinies of mankind." The recognition of this development in our island-story is so suggestive of Divine overruling that it may be profitable to linger for a few pages on the theme.

If we take our starting-point at the age of the Crusades, as corresponding roughly to an epoch when England was becoming conscious of herself as a nation, we find, as we should expect, that the patriotic sentiment of that age is very primitive, very much bound up with hero-worship and open to the charge of cruelty towards outsiders. It is often but little removed from the spirit of the later schoolboy rhyme—

> "Two skinny Frenchmen, one Portugee,
> One jolly Englishman lick 'em all three."

Richard of the Lion-heart is often regarded as the typical English hero of his day, troubadour as well as soldier, the paladin whom as boys we learned to adore in 'Ivanhoe.' And yet Richard is represented in a romance of the period as deliberating what to do with 60,000 Saracen prisoners, and as hearing a voice from heaven calling: "Seigneurs, tuez! tuez! Spare them not, and behead them." Whereupon, as the chronicler puts it—

> "King Richard heard the angels' voice,
> And thanked God and the holy cross."

In a somewhat later age the spirit of English nationalism showed itself in a form admirably described by Mr Wingfield Stratford, as "the abounding joyousness of a nation finding herself, and her greatness, taking her place in Europe like a queen among her peers. It is by no accident that her singers delight to dwell upon the month of May, for there is something peculiarly spring-like about the age—the high spirits, and perhaps some of the rawness and brutality of youth." There is a poem giving thanks for the victory of Agincourt, wherein we find the expression of patriotic gratitude undoubtedly growing more conscious of debt to God, though as yet little more aware of obligation to brother-men. One verse is :—

> "Our king went forth to Normandy
> With grace and might of chivalry;
> There God for him wrought marvellously,
> Wherefore England may call and cry,
> Deo gratias:
> Deo gratias Anglia redde pro victoria."

In the age of Elizabeth there is manifest a still deepening sense of national indebtedness to God, with an uplifting conviction that the triumphs wrought by His loving-kindness have been of good over evil, and of right over wrong. The fact that during this period our land was on its defence against mighty and unscrupulous foes,

and was fighting for a cause felt to be holy, so consecrated patriotic speech and song that no baptism into a spirit of wider service was felt to be needful. Our countrymen, it has been truly said, were conscious of only two great realities—the Fatherland and God—and it was hardly to be expected that at this stage there should be conjoined with these an outlook on the larger welfare of mankind. The Queen's wish expressed the ideal for all—

> "Desiring you true English hearts to bear
> To God, to her, and to the land wherein you nursed were."

A prayer is on record, composed for the Queen, and used at this period in the Royal chapel: "She seeketh not her honour, but Thine; not the domination of others, but a just defence of herself; not the shedding of Christian blood, but the saving of poor afflicted souls. Come down therefore, come down, and deliver Thy people by her. . . . The cause is Thine, the enemies Thine; the honour, victory, and triumph shall be Thine." One feels that a nation so set upon obedience to the first and great commandment, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God," cannot now be far away from recognition of the second commandment, which is like unto it, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

A clearly-marked distinction between Shake-

speare and Milton in respect of their utterance of love of country may be taken at this point to illustrate the general development we are tracing, and to indicate through one particular bend of the river a suggestive tendency towards change of direction. The patriotism of Shakespeare is plain for all men to see. It stands out in the historical plays in passages which are among the treasures of our national literature. Never did love of country receive nobler expression than in many speeches which all readers know, or should know, by heart, and never was a more radiant diadem placed upon the head of a Queen than that which Shakespeare has placed upon the brow of the land he loved—of that England, "precious stone, set in the silver sea." It is a great gift of God to our nation, for which we do well to be humbly grateful, that the noblest qualities of patriotism—in so far as concerns direct love for England herself—should have been sung as Shakespeare alone could sing them. The reader may well be led to impress upon his own conscience the dying words of Wolsey—

> "Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's,
> Thy God's, and truth's."

Nevertheless, the patriotism of Shakespeare has many limitations when compared with later ideals. In his treatment of Joan of Arc, to whom he could pay no homage, because she was a French-

woman and an enemy; in the schoolboy-like assumption that an Englishman was a match for many foreigners—

> "I thought upon one pair of English legs
> Did march three Frenchmen;"

even in the treatment of the opening scene in 'King Henry V.,' where the Archbishop of Canterbury, being charged in the name of God to "take heed" concerning his counsel for peace or war, urges to war on the score of territorial gain, and says—

> "The sin upon my head, dread Sovereign . . .
> Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
> Look back upon your mighty ancestors;"

—in these instances and a host of others, we see that while English patriotism came in Shakespeare to an ardour never surpassed and to an expression never equalled, it was still somewhat in bondage to weak and beggarly elements, and had not yet been stung by the splendour of the thought that it might become an instrument of world-wide service.

On the other hand, when we pass from Shakespeare to Milton, we are conscious of a distinct advance in respect of moral elevation. Milton's patriotism is fundamentally religious, and being so, moves to a goal outside itself. He is amply persuaded that national greatness is the result

of divine election; but also, that the end whereto that election moves is the service of God and man. "Why was this nation chosen," he demands —and let it be noted, in passing, that to ask the question "why" is to introduce a new moral dimension into the reckoning—"before any other, that out of her as out of Sion should be proclaimed and sounded forth the first tidings and trumpet of reformation to all Europe? Had it not been the obstinate perverseness of our prelates against the divine and admirable spirit of Wicklif . . . the glory of reforming our neighbours had been completely ours." The desire after the glory of "reforming all our neighbours" may sound a little crude when thus starkly expressed, but at least it betrays a dawning consciousness that the world is a "neighbourhood." And the same spirit shines out still more conspicuously from another passage in the 'Areopagitica,' where we find a first primitive outline of a League of Nations. Speaking of each nation offering some specific contribution to the common good of all, a conception which does not seem to have been expressed by any earlier writer, Milton says: "Here I behold the stout and manly prowess of the German disdaining servitude; there, the generous and lively impetuosity of the French; on this side the calm and stately valour of the Spaniard; on that, the composed and wary magnanimity of the

Italian. Surrounded by congregated multitudes, I behold the nations of the earth recovering that liberty which they so long had lost; and the people of this island disseminating the blessings of freedom and civilisation among citizens, kingdoms, and nations." It is impossible to conceive of this sentence having been written in an earlier century. The river of British patriotism has bent itself in a new direction. Not only is it deepening in intelligence and enlarging in volume, but it has come within clear view of the final goal of stewardship.

There is a wide gulf of years between the age of Milton and the age of William Pitt; and yet it is only when we came to the period of the great Commoner that we find a marked development in the recognition by a public man of the principle of national trusteeship. Oliver Cromwell, indeed, showed concern for the persecuted Vaudois, whose moans, as Milton told him—

> "The vales redoubled to the hills
> And they to heaven,"

and the Protector was able, by the mere terror of his name, to compel the Pope to pay heed to his protest. But Cromwell's concern for the "slaughtered saints" was perhaps too closely connected with political motives to rank as an adequate response to Milton's famous appeal, or to mark a broadening sense of human solidarity. It is

only when we come to the age of Pitt that we find ourselves in a new environment. There is beginning now to emerge into public recognition what Mr Gladstone boldly called "England's great tradition"—the tradition, namely, that "England can never forswear her interest in the common transactions and the general interests of Europe." Parliament is in Pitt's time growing accustomed to appeals based on motives higher than those of national self-preservation, and is summoned to an outlook more extensive than earlier politicians would have thought possible to men of affairs. To re-read in the present hour the noble series of war speeches delivered by Pitt in the House of Commons between 1793 and his death in 1805, is to realise afresh what a gift of Providence that statesman was to Britain, and this in respect not merely of temporal security, but of moral elevation. In the very first speech which Pitt made in the House of Commons after the declaration of war in 1793, he defined the objects of the contest as "the tranquillity of this country, the security of its allies, the good order of every European government, *and the happiness of the whole human race.*" When in 1797 Pitt made his historic appeal for national unity in the face of the greatest danger the country had yet known, pleading with those whose stake was great in the country, and with those whose stake seemed small, to unite in playing

their part, he spoke of "the example we have to set to the other nations of Europe," and a "right view of the lot in which Providence has placed us." In a later oration there stands this moving appeal: "I need not remind the House that we are come to a new era in the history of nations; that we are called to struggle for the destiny not of this country only, but of the civilised world. It is not for ourselves alone that we submit to unexampled privations. The duty of the people of England now is of a nobler and higher order. . . . Amid the wreck and misery of nations, our highest exultation ought to be, that we provide not only for our own safety, but hold out a prospect to nations now bending under the iron yoke of tyranny, of what the exertions of a free people can effect."

An interesting hint of the wide and comprehensive reach of Pitt's outlook on the world may be found in an apparently trifling circumstance to be noted in one of his speeches. This circumstance is his manner of rectifying a verbal slip. He had begun a sentence in the following terms: "I wish, for the benefit of Europe, that——" And then he corrects himself, and begins again: "I wish, for the benefit of the world at large, that——" It is well known that the last speech of Pitt's life was one of two sentences, delivered in reply to the proposal of his health as "the

saviour of Europe." "I return you many thanks for the honour you have done me, but Europe is not to be saved by any single man. England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example."

It is wholly impossible to imagine the spirit of these utterances of "the pilot who weathered the storm," showing itself in any British politician of an earlier century; they correspond to a change of standpoint marked and undeniable. And it is specially to be noted that the reverence paid by Pitt to the new ideals was not one of mere lip-homage, but one which was embodied in serious and deliberate acts of statesmanship. He offered in one series of peace negotiations to restore to France all her captured colonies, on condition that she restored in Europe the conquests she there had made—an arrangement bringing no gain to Pitt's own nation. And at a later date, in revising the terms of peace he would consider, he introduced as a relevant ground of decision, "the miseries of the unfortunate negroes" in the West Indies. It is not, of course, for a moment suggested that the great Commoner stood alone in the sense of national trusteeship we have tried to indicate. Neither in Parliament nor in the country would his appeals have echoed as they did had his environment not been of an echoing quality. His great rival, Fox, was even more verbally

solicitous than himself for the larger interests of humanity; and Sheridan spoke of "the omnipotence of a British Parliament, demonstrated by extending protection to the helpless and weak in every quarter of the world"—an ideal which even now stretches far beyond our grasp. Whatever view we may take of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, and of the impassioned speeches of Burke, at all events they showed a rising concern on the part of Britain for her reputation in far-off dependencies in the matter of wrongs alleged to be inflicted upon natives. It is evident throughout this period that the sense of trusteeship is already becoming a British principle. The hand of the Almighty is guiding our national love of country to wider issues and nobler cares than it had known before. We have already travelled a long way from the spirit of Goldsmith's description of his fellow-countrymen—

> "Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,
> I see the lords of human kind pass by."

We cease to be engrossed with the mere deepening and broadening of the river of British patriotism in respect of its own increase, and realise with reverence a change of direction in its flow, which impels it to the desert places of human need.

The point need probably not be laboured that in our own day the sense of national trusteeship

and racial responsibility has taken an increasingly secure hold of the best minds in Christendom. "You talk to me," said Mr Gladstone in 1870, "of the established tradition in regard to Turkey. I appeal to an established tradition, older, wider, nobler far—a tradition, not which disregards British interests, but which teaches you to seek the promotion of these interests in obeying the dictates of honour and justice." No British citizen can recall without respect and pride the noble language, and at the same time the sound statecraft, of Queen Victoria's message to the people of India in 1858: "It is our earnest desire . . . to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity shall be our strength, in their contentment our security, in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people." No modern statesman, addressing his own countrymen in Britain or America, hesitates to bespeak concern for the welfare of mankind as an operative principle. The story of the Great War seems to most Anglo-Saxons a final proof of the triumph of the principle of stewardship; since, alike for Britain and America, self-interest was in the nature of the case ruled out as the immediate and preponderating motive of participation. "I do not

believe," said the Prime Minister in 1914—a few days after the outbreak of war—" that any nation ever entered into a great controversy—and this is one of the greatest history will ever know—with a clearer conscience and stronger conviction that it is fighting not for aggression, not for the maintenance even of its own selfish interest, but that it is fighting in defence of principles, the maintenance of which is vital to the civilisation of the world." Only one instance need be adduced of the terms which are now deemed proper in a manifesto issuing from two great Powers. The British and French Governments have recently issued an official proclamation regarding joint policy in the East. They say: " The end that France and Great Britain have in view in the East is the complete and definite freedom of the peoples so long oppressed. . . . To assure equal and impartial justice for all, to facilitate the economic development of the country by promoting and encouraging local initiative, to foster the spread of education, to put an end to divisions too long exploited by Turkish policy, such is the rôle that the two Allied Governments claim in the liberated territories." All human effort falls short of its ideal; and it remains to be seen whether performance matches promise in the case of this manifesto. But the fact remains for thankful contemplation, that the terms of the joint proclamation show an ad-

vance in the conception of national duty which would have been inconceivable in any previous epoch.

Even the broken outline of the development of British patriotism which has now been indicated may serve to lead our minds to one assured conclusion. This is, that the refusal on our part of the responsibilities of national stewardship would be the blackest treachery to what has grown through long and strenuous years to be the British tradition. "It is not to be thought of," says Wordsworth in a famous sonnet—

> "that the flood
> Of British freedom, which to the open sea
> Of the world's praise, from dark antiquity
> Hath flowed, with pomp of waters unwithstood,
> . . . . . .
> That this most famous stream in bogs and sands
> Should perish."

How much less is it to be thought of that the stream of world-wide service which we have beheld speeding to noble ends should now be bound in the shallows and miseries of ideals restricted to our own prosperity. Burke might well repeat to us in such a case that little minds go ill with great empires.

Fortified, then, by such memories of a growing tradition of stewardship in British patriotism, we proceed to ask in what more detailed respects the tradition may best be realised in the life of our

time. It will be necessary to restrict the discussion within narrow limits. The wide subject of international relationships, with the reciprocal duties implied, stretches far beyond the reach of the powers of the present writer. We shall confine our field of view to the British Empire. We shall inquire what "ministry of the Exterior" falls to our countrymen in their capacity as Christian patriots.

It is at once obvious that, with respect to this inquiry, Great Britain is in a peculiar position. There are in her case, as Westcott pointed out a generation ago, three outlets of national service, open after the same fashion to no other people. She looks out, in the first place, upon her *sister*-peoples, her equals in the gifts of civilisation—France, Italy, America, and the rest. She looks out, in the second place, over her *daughter*-peoples, those self-governing dependencies which are her peculiar treasure. And she looks out, in the third place, upon the *weaker races* of the world, whose uplift forms the white man's burden, and for many of whom she is the deeply responsible trustee. No other nation has ever had a task laid upon her so vast in extent, so complex in its elements. We are compelled to echo in all humility the question of the apostle: "Who is sufficient for these things?"

It should be made very clear at this point, even

at the risk of subsequent repetition, that the mention of "weaker" races is neither to be made in a patronising frame, nor to be associated with the thought of permanent weakness in any particular case. A modern student of science, arguing upon grounds derived from the study of the processes of evolution, has ventured the deliberate conclusion that the dominant race of the future is likely to be found among those not now in the van of human progress. And the story of Japan during the last quarter of a century is enough to show that a people thought of at one period as belonging to the weaker races may rank in the immediately succeeding era as a great power. Bishop Westcott's prophecy is well known—and it leads to a higher level of outlook over the same prospect—that many elements in the teaching of St John will be fully interpreted to the world only when the mystical mind of India has addressed itself to their study. We cannot tell what racial fulfilment may one day be given to the words of our Lord: "many that are last shall be first, and the first last."

I.

The duty of Christian patriotism towards those sister-peoples who share our civilisation and speak with us in the gate on equal terms will here be

dealt with only in respect of two very general considerations. In a volume of university sermons which has run an unusual course and become an English classic, Mozley has dealt, among other subjects, with "Duty to Equals," and has pointed out that in the life of the individual Christian, duties to equals are often more taxing in their claims than duties which relate to inferiors or dependents. A cherished self-complacency is more ministered to, when we are compassionate to those beneath us, show generosity to their needs, and pity towards their sufferings, than when we merely bear ourselves with due humility and fairness to those who, as equals, may also be competitors and rivals. In the first instance, we are subtly flattered by our own benevolence; in the second instance, no platform of superiority exalts us, no gratitude feeds our pride. "A man is in competition with his equals; and he is not in competition with his inferiors. . . . It is much harder to be fair to an equal than to be ever so generous to an inferior." It follows, by a just and inevitable extension of this truth, that there are tests of national character for Great Britain in the way we behave to America or France or Germany (and, let it be added, to Americans, French, or Germans) which do not apply with the same stringency to our dealings with Africa or China or the South Sea Islands. Pride may be menaced in the one

case, as it can hardly be in the other. Hence the need of Christian patriotism to gird itself, not first to be generous, but first to be just; and to face the task of national probation before it assumes the responsibilities of national mission. We must try to see ourselves from without and our fellows from within. When we use such phrases as the claims of nationalism, or the rights of self-determination, we must at least make sure that we have conformed to the Irishman's stipulation, that "the reciprocity should not be all on one side."

Here as elsewhere, however, when we loyally confront our duty, we see what Wordsworth called "the smile upon her face." For—to mention only one mollifying consideration—who can be too narrowly nationalistic in face of the common property held by all mankind in the produce of literature, music, and art? Are not the works of Shakespeare, the music of Beethoven, the genius of Pascal, the paintings of Titian, the common property and glory of the human race? Did not a distinguished Frenchman, even in a moment of impassioned protest against the shameful brutalities suffered by his country in the war, school himself to speak of "*our* Goethe," and do so that he might the better point to those heights "where we feel the happiness and the misfortunes of other peoples as our own"? "Kill men if

you like," cried this prophet, " for they are enemies ; but respect masterpieces—they are the patrimony of the human race." Such an arrow of appeal may not strike quite fair upon the target, but at all events it guides the eye to where a target is. Birth and death, the cry of pain and the shout of joy, unite men and do not divide them ; the achievements of genius partake of this elemental power.

It is under the head of duty towards sister-peoples that there comes into view the whole complex of considerations, which are grouped in our day round the conception of a League of Nations. Upon these the writer has not the training to throw any useful light. But it may at least be said that whatever validity belongs to the general argument of this book is already enlisted as the willing servant of the ideal of the League of Nations. A dedicated patriotism, worshipping God and not her own image, will recognise in the supreme cause of human brotherhood an end worthy of the best that even she can bring, and furnishing an altar to which our Lord's words about sacrifice may be applied, that the altar sanctifieth the gift. What the precise future of the League of Nations may be is hidden from our knowledge. But it is much to know that the vision has been beheld. " There is only one thing," said Victor Hugo, " stronger than armies—an idea

whose time has come." Mr Gladstone said half a century ago that the enthronement of the idea of public right as the governing idea of European politics would be the greatest triumph of the age; and it would seem that at least the throne is being erected for such a coronation. It is to be remembered that a changed temper in public opinion is the instrument above all others whereby the triumph of the League of Nations may be brought about, and that with this changed temper every citizen has to do. While the Great War was still in progress, and many apparently insuperable obstacles to victory were gradually being overcome, a captain of industry in the West of Scotland made a suggestive remark to a friend. "There are some problems," he said, "in the spiritual and social world which are like some of our metals—altogether refractory to low temperatures. They will only melt with great heat, and there is no other possibility of melting them." The remark carries with it its own interpretation. Public opinion, upon which in the relationship of peoples so much depends, is simply the opinion of "all the rest of us." Let the moral temperature rise by some degrees, and let friendliness (not wrath) be nursed to keep it warm, and difficulties otherwise intractable will dissolve, prejudices otherwise refractory will melt away.

II.

The relation of British patriotism to the daughter-peoples of the Empire has many points of kinship with the wider relationship just touched upon. For it may be claimed that the League of Nations as a general conception, and even the particular form in which the League is at present shaped, have found their first suggestion and hopeful impulse within the bounds of the British Empire. The peoples of our self-governing Dominions no longer think of themselves as occupying a subordinate relation to the mother country. It was this fact which more than any other imprinted itself upon the imagination of the Prince of Wales on his return from a recent tour in the Empire. "We sprang to the front," said a Canadian statesman not long ago, speaking in the Dominion House of Commons, "as a nation among the world's nations." Just as in the League of Nations, the ultimate authority would be found in a conference of the principal states, so in the British Empire the ultimate authority now rests with conferences of an Imperial Cabinet, representing the Dominions and India, as well as the United Kingdom. Just as the League proposes to entrust executive action to the constituent states, so the Empire leaves the constituent Dominions free to carry out deci-

sions. The relationship between the League and undeveloped autonomous territory is very similar to that existing between the British Government and the Crown colonies and protectorates under its jurisdiction; while the economic and police policy suggested for the League follows closely in its outline the traditional policy of the British Empire. "People talk," said General Smuts in 1919—and let it be remembered that the speaker is a soldier-statesman who once fought against us —"about a League of Nations and international government; but the only successful experiment in international government that has ever been made is the British Empire, founded on principles which appeal to the highest ideals of mankind." An old English writer of the eighteenth century —influenced doubtless by Boston Harbour and Bunker's Hill—set down his thoughts on Colonies in quaint language. "The management," he said, "of so complicated and mighty a machine as the United Colonies requires the meekness of Moses, the patience of Job, and the wisdom of Solomon, added to the valour of David." It is perhaps some proof of genuine national vocation that, even without the Hebrew equipment thus desiderated, the British Empire should in our day be the world's pattern for a wider national brotherhood. When a great American said that God never made one nation good enough to rule another, he did not

exclude the possibility that one nation might by divine appointment tutor another to rule itself.

III.

We reach what is to the writer the most congenial duty laid upon him in this chapter, when we ask what outlet of national service is open to Great Britain in respect of the **weaker races** of mankind, for so many of whom she is the responsible trustee. The position it is proposed to contend for is, that by all the noblest elements in a Christian patriotism —by the love we bear our country, the joy we have in its past history, the hope we cherish for its future—we are impelled to deep concern for the welfare of the weaker races of the world, and especially of our own Empire, and to an earnest desire to share with them those truths and that Gospel which will one day prepare them to offer their own contribution to the sum-total of human good. A patriot cannot wish his country to be worse than he is himself. He must desire it to obey the constraint laid upon it by what is best in its own past. And therefore a Christian patriot will covet to reduce to practice the maxim whose impassioned utterance by a missionary-statesman many years ago the writer well remembers : " civilisation is not aggrandisement ; it is responsibility."

The motives impelling to this conclusion are of many kinds. Some of them are in the best sense idealistic; others are severely practical. When united, they form a body of motive, whose plea cannot be disregarded without betrayal of the very notion of patriotism, inasmuch as little would be left to the disregarding country which a Christian patriot could either love or respect.

We proceed to justify this statement by recapitulating or amplifying some considerations which constrain to it. And let it be remembered by way of cold arithmetical introduction, that out of an estimated population of 413,000,000 in the British Empire, only 52,000,000, or one in eight, are white.

i.

Let us ask ourselves afresh, at the risk of repetition, in what we as patriots consider the true greatness of our country to consist. Obviously this question cannot be answered, consistently with the holding of a Christian standpoint, by adducing any greatness that is merely of **geographical bulk.** Seeley ridiculed long ago the kind of statement which declares that in the British Empire "the morning drum-beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, encircles the globe with an unbroken chain of martial airs." Even the assertion of Cecil Rhodes, often repeated to his

friends, "it came to me in that fine exhilarating air that the British were the best race to rule the world," lends itself to easy ridicule. Great Britain is not the first empire which has lengthened its cords and extended its shadow over many lands, and has said, "I have made myself great, and have obtained much wealth." The names of others stand out in history—names that once shook the earth, names like Nineveh and Babylon, like Asoka's Empire and Persia, like Carthage and Venice. On each of these the sun of prosperity has now gone down and the night has fallen. To each of them in turn has been addressed the word first spoken to the king of Babylon: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" We must covet for our national ideals a more permanent influence in the world than belonged to the "winged beast from Babylon," which Dante Gabriel Rossetti saw hoisted in to the murky London museum—

> "Where school-foundations in the act
> Of holiday, three files compact,
> Shall learn to view thee as a fact
> Connected with that zealous tract—
> 'Rome—Babylon—and Nineveh.'"

Still less can we find a rational basis for exuberance of patriotic joy in the mere material wealth

of our country, or in its commercial prosperity. Such a basis would suggest too readily Keats' ironic question concerning the wealthy brothers of Isabella—

> "Why were they proud? Again we ask aloud,
> Why in the name of glory were they proud?"

There is a character in the 'Wrecker,' who is reported by his son to have embraced a certain idea "with a mixture of patriotism and commercial greed, both perfectly genuine." This odd admixture is still discoverable in circles where "patriots" of a certain type abound. But the prophecy may be hazarded that Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell, is likely in the future to be not only a pitiful deity, but a discredited one. It was pointed out by Dr Wotherspoon, during the course of the war, that if money was indeed Britain's idol, then God was making us burn our idol at the rate of six millions a day. Mankind is probably more ready to listen regardfully now than in the past to the implied challenge of our Lord: "What shall it profit a nation, if it gain the whole world, and lose its own soul?" If any reader doubts that a change of feeling with respect to money is slowly taking place, let him mark a single straw which floats upon the current, and ask what implication now attaches itself to the word "millionaire." Is it the implication of "admiration mingled with

awe," with which the historic undergraduate said at a venture that the Decalogue should be regarded? Or are we coming, however tardily, to set our seal to the saying of Joubert, that "to talk of nothing but prosperity and commerce is to talk like a merchant, and not like a philosopher; to aim only at the enriching of nations is to act like a banker, but not like a legislator."

It is plain that any glory of greatness in our country wherein we as Christian patriots may lawfully rejoice, must be found in the splendour of the stewardship with which Almighty God has entrusted us; and in the assurance, if such assurance be justified, that in the past we have veritably received strength in some measure to fulfil it. After the recent conquest of South-West Africa, the sister of a chief of the country, an old woman, said to a correspondent of the 'Times': "For years we leaders of the people have longed, hoped, and dreamed for the day when *the flag with the crosses on it* would fly over us; and now that flag has come, do you think we should assist to haul it down?" When the correspondent asked her why she so loved this flag, she answered: "The flag with the crosses on it means to us blacks Christianity, love, and kindness, as compared with force, brutality, and harshness." In India, so competent and level-minded an authority as Sir F. Younghusband says that "the British people

has now embarked upon the noblest adventure, the grandest enterprise ever attempted by any race in history." If as British citizens we must needs glory, we will glory of such things as these. "No man shall stop us of *this* boasting in the regions of Achaia."

ii.

The history of the British Empire offers strong corroboration of a divine purpose akin to that revealed in the case of Cyrus: "I have girded thee, though thou hast not known me." Nothing is more certain than that Greater Britain has not reached its present magnitude and importance through careful study, coherent policy, firmly-grasped design—Machiavellian or otherwise—but after a fashion which suggests that on the helm has rested a Hand "other than ours." The first foreshadowings of our Indian Empire were indicated, as is well known, in a fact so trivial as a rise in the price of pepper on the London market; and nothing would more have astonished the pioneers of commerce than a vision of that whereto this thing would grow. The happy phrase of Seeley has passed into common speech, that we seem to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind. But would it not be more seemly for the Christian citizen to put the

same thing in another way, and to say that where fortune seems to count for so much and human purpose for so little, we may reverently apply to the fortune the well-known line of Browning—

> "Hush, I pray you!
> What if this friend happen to be—God."

No man of Christian character can help raising the point, as Milton raised it, as to the *end* for which our race has been called to so great a heritage, and the only end which seems worthy of so great a vocation is this, that we should as a nation reflect to others the light of truth which has shone upon ourselves. The best religion is the only religion suited for the whole world, and we dare not pour the contempt of silence upon the faith which has made us what we are. "Suppose," said Major-General Sir Herbert Edwardes in 1860, speaking with admitted authority and with prophetic force, "there were to arise in the hearts of any number of our countrymen a strong conviction that India is a stewardship; that it could not have been for *nothing* that God placed it in the hands of England; that He would never have put upon 200 millions of men the heavy trial of being subject to thirty millions of foreigners merely to have their roads improved, their letters carried by a penny post, their geography corrected, nor even to have

their internal quarrels stopped, and life ameliorated; that there must have been in India some far greater want than even these: suppose this conviction were gradually to grow up into that giant thing that statesmen cannot hold—the *public opinion of the land*—what would be the consequence? Why, this: the English people would resolve to do their duty. England, taught by both past and present, would set before her the whole policy of first fitting India for freedom and then setting her free. . . . And ever remember there is but one way by which it can be reached. . . . Till India is leavened with Christianity she will be unfit for freedom. *When* India is leavened with Christianity, she will be unfit for any form of slavery, however mild."

iii.

When duty is obeyed in scorn of consequence, reason, sooner or later, adds a consenting voice. We are pleading for the position that there is a special debt of honour due to weaker races by those nations which march in the vanguard of human progress; and that, if there be one country more than another for whom that debt is weighty, it is Great Britain. We are pleading, further, for the concession that the best we have to give is the

Christian Gospel, together with the Christian ethic which accompanies it. And at this point a consideration meets us, whose appeal is in a lawful sense to our own self-interest. The consideration is one whose neglect is responsible for the existence of some of the most tangled skeins which are to-day waiting for our unravelment throughout the empire. It is the consideration that without certain virtues of *character*, which can only be looked for as the moral deposit of Christianity, the self-government we design for our pupil-peoples is rendered impossible of attainment. Self-government obviously depends upon a capacity in a sufficient number of individuals to put the interests of other people on a par with their own ; and for this, character is fundamental. Hence it will be found, as the late Canon Scott Holland expressed it in a striking sentence, that Imperial rule has created a situation which of itself Imperial rule has no power to solve.

Proof of this contention will at once appear, if we follow for a moment the usual course of development in non-Christian countries which have come under British control.[1] The development, as a rule, has taken shape in three stages, not equally happy, nor obviously alike in success. The first stage

[1] The following paragraphs owe their first suggestion to a magazine article by the late Canon Scott Holland, read many years ago.

could not be better defined than in the well-known words of Kipling—

"Keep ye the law—be swift in all obedience—
Clear the land of evil, drive the road and bridge the ford.
Make ye sure to each his own
That he reap where he hath sown."

Here British organising power is at its best. The task is one that suits our national genius; and before long, good roads, dependable bridges, even-handed justice mark the country that has come under the British raj. Patriotism of the superficial kind is satisfied. Nothing seems left to wish for, except the construction of a few golf-courses, and jubilant display of the Union Jack.

But ere long it begins to appear that one thing has a disconcerting way of leading to another. The situation is not so naïvely simple as had been conceived. For even in an undeveloped country it appears that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." You may expel nature with a fork, as Horace said, but it will come back, even in the face of agitated administrators. For now the native begins to cry out for *education*. He sees that the achievements of his tutors are the result of what they know, and why should he not learn as they have done? A troublesome request, but wholly natural. It is not consistent with our national sense of fairplay to deny a fellow-being

this privilege. Did not a very great man once inscribe in a University class-room: "In the World there is nothing great but Man; in Man there is nothing great but Mind"? One cannot follow a statement like that with the proviso, "not for export." Accordingly, with great reluctance and many misgivings, Britain enters upon the second stage of her colonising activities—education. Some attempt at an educational system is set up, and by and by many of our pupils have tasted of the tree of knowledge, and a few of them sit under its shadow with great delight.

And then it comes to pass that with grumblings not loud but deep we are forced to enter upon the perilous third stage of our colonising progress. This is the stage marked by the demand of our protégés for some measure of *self-government.* We find that there is no half-way house, and that a half-nation cannot be created permanently, any more than a child can be stopped growing. And now we are forced to recognise the imperative necessity of "a certain common conscience, on which we can continually count," if there is to be effective fellowship in the government of the country. It must be possible to make fixed ethical assumptions without discussion. Unless there is a moral standard accepted by all, some moral imperative binding upon all, co-operation in public affairs is vain. At this stage we begin to discover

that the corporate conscience, readily taken for granted, on which self-government is built in England and Scotland, is "the moral deposit of historic Christianity," and is permeated from top to bottom by Christian beliefs. "Its sensitiveness to the rights of the individual man, to the position of woman, to the claims of purity and truth, to the calls for service and self-sacrifice, have their spring and source in the creed of the Incarnation." Thus we are driven by the logic of facts to the old prophetic conclusion that "God also is Wise." In every aspect of His Gospel wisdom is justified of her children. If God has bidden Christian men preach the Gospel to every creature, it will appear sooner or later that obedience to this command brings blessing, and disobedience disaster.

iv.

Another consideration tending to show that the fostering of a missionary policy by a Christian country is wise as well as right, and patriotic as well as dutiful, is derived from the increasing proof now offered to us that the nations form one body, and that if one member suffer all the members suffer with it. The quite solitary place in history occupied by the nineteenth century in respect of rapidity of change tending to abolish distance and to bind mankind into a single bundle of life is

seldom, even yet, adequately apprehended. We are so absurdly sensitive to the peril of exaggeration, that we often completely under-estimate the transformation wrought upon the world during the last hundred years. Is it often recognised, for instance, that when all is said and done, Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and Napoleon of France used essentially the same method of land locomotion—namely, wheeled vehicles drawn by horses? Is the fact clearly visualised that the ships which bore the Greeks to Troy were in principle the same kind of ships as those which carried Nelson to Trafalgar? It is only within the last hundred years that horses have ceased to fix the rate of speed by land, and sails by water. The world has suddenly shrunk, as under the imperative gesture of a conjurer. The writer well remembers reading in his boyhood what seemed to the eyes of boyhood an engrossing romance, entitled 'Round the World in Eighty Days.' The final sensation was produced by the device of representing a bet to compass the earth in eighty days as lost by a few hours, until the hero remembered that having travelled by way of the East, he had gained a day from the clock, and could therefore walk into the rendezvous, cool and immaculate, on the stroke of time. How little could the author of that story have supposed that within the space of half a century he would almost have had to alter "days"

to "hours" in the title to produce the mildest thrill in the breast of the least sophisticated of his readers. The world is now too small a place for any country to refuse to be bound in the bundle of life with its neighbours. The nation is made foolish in the court of wisdom, as well as proved guilty before the bar of right, which acts the part of the priest and levite, and so allows the wounded traveller to act as a centre of infection to the region. When the pestilence of influenza first broke out in Britain thirty years ago, and took a toll of lives so tragically increased in later decades, it was believed by capable officers of health that the source of infection was to be found in an erupting volcano in Japan. Millions of tons of volcanic dust had, it was known, been carried round the world in the air, and the conjecture was offered that this dust was organic and capable of infection. Whether or not this theory is still upheld in respect of argument, it is abundantly profitable in respect of parable. A moral pestilence in one part of the world readily infects another. We cannot afford to ignore ignorances, injustices, depravities in any part of the globe. It is vain to say, "let the weaker races alone." Western commerce and civilisation have already refused to let them alone; and it is a pitiful reflection that the traveller who sees a native at a port sees him at his worst, just because the port is

the place where our civilisation and his are most commingled.

v.

We shall now observe in one final point the fulfilment of the promise that to men or nations who put first things first, lesser things will be duly added. We shall ask the reader to note how much the British name owes of its lustre, and the British nation of temporal wellbeing, to those Christian missionaries who went forth with no ulterior motive as pioneers of the Gospel, and then found incidentally a reward for which they never sought. If Clive, for instance, has the repute of conquering India, Carey and his companions can claim the credit of giving to our Indian Empire a stable foundation. It is to their devoted labours, as has often been shown, that we owe the abolition of suttee and of the exposure of infants, the introduction of the vernacular printing-press, and the first beginnings of that educational system which has wrought such far-reaching change in India. The principles of policy enunciated in the proclamation of Queen Victoria in 1858 (part of which has been already quoted), and brought to ampler fulfilment in the Governmental action of our own day, are no more than the logical completion of a movement which originated with Carey and the founders of the Serampore Mission.

Innumerable other instances might be adduced of Britain's indebtedness to her missionary pioneers. It happens that in the very week of writing these words, a canon of Westminster Abbey, preaching there, is reported to have said: "There are thousands who come to this old abbey every year. I have had the privilege of showing many of them through the building. The first grave they ask to see is not that of the kings and queens who are buried here; not those of the great statesmen, warriors, poets, philosphers, and historians; but the grave of David Livingstone." Livingstone travelled 29,000 miles and explored a million square miles of territory, beside recording valuable facts as to tropical diseases, and introducing to Europe twenty-five different sorts of fruits. Of George Grenfell, a pioneer missionary on the Congo, the 'Times' said after a memorial service held in London: "Few explorers in any part of the world have made such extensive and valuable contributions to geographical knowledge as this modest missionary." At the Royal Geographical Society's annual meeting in 1884, it was remarked that whereas all other expeditions into the interior of New Guinea had partially failed, "the intrepidity of Dr Chalmers had carried him further inland than any European colonist." Dr W. T. Grenfell, the knight-errant of Labrador, is said to know more of the coast-line, of the rivers, forests,

fauna, and general features of Labrador than any living man. Even the most primitive kind of patriotism may be impressed by the statement, put forward in no missionary interest, that the presence of Dr Pennell in Bannu among the fanatical tribes of the Afghan frontier was worth two battalions of soldiers. But, indeed, it is needless to multiply examples. A famous map-maker has packed the essential facts into the dictum that there is scarcely a record of exploration in any land which does not acknowledge its indebtedness to missionaries.

Linguistic and scientific achievement, bringing honour to the fatherland, has been a familiar accompaniment of missionary enterprise. The competent 'Centennial Survey of Foreign Missions' devotes upwards of forty pages to the titles of translations made by missionaries. Botany, zoology, ethnology owe much to the researches of those whose primary occupation was the preaching and embodying of the Gospel. Baron of Madagascar sent many hundreds of plants to Kew to be described and classified; and it was noted of the same missionary at the time of his death, that whenever the French Government required official scientific information on questions relating to Madagascar, they always appealed to him. Mr Gulick in Japan arrested the attention of so famous a scientist as G. J. Romanes by his communi-

cations on natural history, and readers of Romanes' profoundly interesting book, 'Thoughts on Religion,' will remember what a commanding influence Mr Gulick had in helping the naturalist to a recovered Christian faith. If it be true, as Mr Gladstone said, that the three highest titles that can be given to man are those of martyr, hero, and saint, we may add that no one of these three titles would be inappropriate for such fellow-countrymen as we have named, and for their many comrades who in the service of Christ in foreign lands have been true to the kindred points of Heaven and Home.

The impression one would fain leave at the close of this chapter is that of the heart-content which may be found by a nation in the entrustment to it of certain endowments and aptitudes for the welfare of mankind. If the nation be in any sense a Christian nation, conscious of indebtedness to the Christian teaching of the past, then it must in some degree share the joyful wonder of a Christian apostle, that he should have been "approved of God to be put in trust with the Gospel." There is such a thing as a national character with a life and spirit of its own; and therefore there is such a thing as the judgment of a nation, distinct from the judgment of the individuals who compose it. There is no more shameful failure possible to men than failure to respond to a solemn trust. When

we in Britain reflect that if we were in fact the Christian nation we claim to be, the British Empire would offer to the hand of Providence the finest instrument yet forged for the spread of the kingdom of truth, we cannot but shrink from the peril of betraying such a charge.

On the other hand, if the charge be not betrayed, we have the assurance of the blessing which is "added" to those who seek first the kingdom of God. The innocent loyalties of patriotism will be redeemed from pride; its close-knit ties will be strengthened in a comradeship which will threaten none; the innocent delight of a patriot in the exploits of his fellow-countrymen will become only the agent of personal humility; his own individual contribution will be laid upon the common altar, which sanctifieth the gift. Thus the individual will bring his contribution to the nation, and the nation her contribution to the race, to the end that individual nation and race together may share in a larger patriotism still—the Patriotism of the Kingdom of Heaven.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PATRIOTISM OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

"The poet says, Dear city of Cecrops; shall I not say, Dear City of God?"—MARCUS AURELIUS.

"We are a Colony of heaven."

—PHILIPP. iii. 20 (Moffatt's Translation).

"The Roman poet Horace calls death a departure 'in æternum exilium'; Christians called it a return 'in patriam'; all the difference between the two points of view is there."—HOLLAND.

"But that which put glory of grace into all that He did, was, that He did it out of pure love to His Country."

—BUNYAN, *Pilgrim's Progress.*

CHAPTER VII.

The few pages which follow are designed rather as an epilogue than as an independent chapter. They will point to a region lying in strictness beyond the boundary of the subject already studied. They will invite the reader, without leaving the territory he has already explored, to climb to a view-point within the limits of that territory, and thence, like the prophet, to behold an inheritance in the distance whose effective occupation is the task of another day.

We have in earlier chapters been dealing with patriotism in its original form of love of an earthly country. We have recognised it in this primitive sphere as a divinely-implanted instinct, honourable in its origin, authoritative in its commands, and capable of forming an incomparable instrument of Christian service. We have concluded that the heart which does not catch fire at the bright blaze of patriotic ardour is hard to kindle, and remains the colder and poorer for its lack. But the question is not an idle one as to whether there may be

an absolute form of patriotism to which earthly patriotism is relative. Can the phrase "love of country" be caught up into any practical connection with the "Country" of which Christian poets have often sung, and with the "Celestial City" to which Christian pilgrims have often travelled? Can the expression be brought into useful association with such a term as that of the "Kingdom of Heaven"; with such a historic title as "The City of God"; or with lines so familiar to Christian worship as those which exclaim—

> "O sweet and blessed country,
> The home of God's elect"?

If Marcus Aurelius could say that "man is a citizen of that sublimest state of which all other states are as it were houses," may we not expect some louder reverberation of this idea in the streets of the city that hath foundations?

The moment we ask these questions, there leaps to mind one outstanding feature in the phraseology of the New Testament. This feature is the prominence in the teaching of Jesus of a word congenial with patriotic sentiment—the word **Kingdom.** Our Saviour spoke of God's Kingdom, not casually, nor once or twice, but persistently and with deliberate enlargement of the term. If there be a metaphor in the words "King" and "Kingdom," when applied to religious experience, the metaphor

is the great Teacher's own. We do well to follow a suggestion inherent in our Lord's own language. It is plain that in whatsoever respects the new Society ranks as a "Kingdom," in these same respects must there be room for a loyalty of its citizens which responds to the challenge of the term, and goes out in pride to the Kingdom and in devotion to the King. Such a patriotism will transcend but not exclude the patriotisms of earth. It will set these last in a just perspective, increase their usefulness by tracing their limits, and give their labours the guarantee of immortality.

The Kingdom of Heaven, as depicted in the teaching of Jesus, has many qualities which ought, in Calvin's phrase, to add no small excitement to us, if we rank ourselves among its loyal citizens. "Consider," said Milton to the rulers of England, "what nation it is whereof ye are and whereof ye are governors—a nation not beneath the reach of any point, the highest that human capacity can soar to." Christian men and women may gratefully brace themselves for a similar consideration in respect of the Kingdom of Heaven, with ampler warrant, a wider field, and an outlook not bounded by time. The teaching of Jesus about God's Kingdom is a rich and complex thing, and because of that inherent wealth the more congruous with the complexity of personal and national life. It

is not a merely "simple" teaching. Simple it is in its use, and offered to the immediate grasp of the most naïve obedience. But it is simple in the same sense as a key might fairly be called so, which turns easily in the lock because of a useful intricacy of pattern corresponding to the lock's many wards. The teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom is multiform, paradoxical, brimming over the confines of logic, and therefore answering all the better to life, to experience—to reality.

It cannot be denied that there is to-day a sharp spur of urgency pricking on Christendom towards the discovery of a "Patriotism" responsive to the call of the Kingdom of Heaven. The children of this world are often, in respect of the nurture of love of country, wiser than the children of light. They are well accustomed to ponder reflectively their country's greatness and thus to become intelligently aware of her vocation. They add fuel to the flame of patriotic ardour by individual and corporate meditation; and in the noblest instances they have achieved a fervour of patriotic zeal, and an intensity of patriotic sacrifice, which we have seen to form one of the wonders of human history. On the other hand, is there anything more sadly lacking in conventional Christianity than just a corresponding fervour of patriotic loyalty in response to our Lord's proclamation of the "Kingdom"? Is it not too often forgotten

that a King cannot be separated from his Kingdom, nor the royal greatness fully recognised apart from the appointed background? It is disconcerting to reflect that the Christian Church seems at certain periods to have evolved a pitiful fragmentary loyalty, of a form sadly peculiar to herself. In earthly states one has frequently observed a loyalty to the kingdom (as in our own Protectorate), which, because of its own intensity, has foresworn loyalty to the king. The Christian Church stands alone among commonwealths in having at times manifested a pseudo-loyalty to her King, which has felt itself absolved from concern in the interests of His Kingdom. We find no clear teaching about the Kingdom of Heaven in the Creeds, in the Shorter Catechism, or in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It seems singular that the Kingdom for which our Saviour lived and died has often as a conception had so little power to engage the interest, stir the feeling, or prompt the sacrifice of those who are called by His name. What manner of patriotic longing should breathe in the prayer, "Thy Kingdom come"? What measure of patriotic loyalty should animate the citizens who "seek first the Kingdom of God"?

Here, however, as so often in other instances, we find the most reasonable hope for the future to spring from cheering features in the retrospect

of the past. When Andrew Melville held his famous interview with James VI. in Falkland Palace, and after a heated argument took the king by the sleeve, calling him "God's sillie vassal," and said: "Sire, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you that there are twa kings and twa kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King and His Kingdom, whose subject King James the Saxt is, and of whose kingdom nocht a king nor a lord nor a heid, but a member. And, Sir, when ye were in your swaddling-clothes Christ Jesus rang freely in this land,"—when Andrew Melville so spoke, it is evident that he felt himself a citizen of two countries whose loyalties were not incompatible, though one was supreme.

Or again, we may take an illustration from still earlier days and a still more classic incident. One of the greatest calamities, as it seemed, that ever overtook the world was the overthrow of the Roman Empire by the Goths about 400 years after Christ. Civilisation looked on in helplessness while the barbarians spoiled the Roman cities, desolated their fertile plains, seized their colonies, and defiled their altars. The hearts of men were shaken as seldom before or since in human history; it seemed as if the mountains were removed and cast into the sea. And just in that hour a great Christian genius stepped forward, and wrote a book which became one of the classics of the world, and

the name of it was 'The City of God.' In it Augustine said in effect: "You were proud, O Romans, of your city. You called her eternal, imperial, divine. You have been compelled to recognise that history is rebuking your pride, and showing your faith unfounded. But I have to tell you, or remind you, of another City, so glorious in promise and achievement that yours may not be named beside her. She is the true Divine City, for her Builder and Maker is God, and she shares the eternity of her Builder." When we contemplate Augustine turning from the wreck of Rome to paint the glories of the City of God, we may justly describe the spirit of the episode as the Patriotism of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Other instances multiply in the view. The writer to the Hebrews read back this higher patriotism into the story of even the Old Testament saints, and spoke of Abraham as looking for a City that had foundations, and of the patriarchs as desiring a better Country that is a heavenly. St Paul spoke of his Citizenship being in heaven, rejoiced that he was a fellow-citizen with the saints, and saw his noblest heritage in the Jerusalem which is above, which is free and the mother of us all. And, to pass in a bound from earliest days to latest, let us hearken to the glowing appeal of Dr Duff to a General Assembly in 1850—"spoken by a Highlander to brother-Scots": "In days

of yore I was wont to listen to the poems of Ossian, and to many of those melodies that were called Jacobite songs. . . . One of these seemed to me to embody the quintessence of loyalty of an earthly kind. It is the stanza in which it is said by the father or mother—

'I hae but ae son, the gallant young Donald';

and then the gush of emotion turned his heart as it were inside out, and he exclaimed—

'But, oh, had I ten, they would follow Prince Charlie.'

Are these the visions of romance—the dreams of poetry and of song? Oh, let that rush of youthful warriors from bracken bush and glen, that rallied round the standards of Glenfinnan, bear testimony to the reality, the intensity of the loyalty to an earthly prince; and shall a Highland father and mother give up all their children as a homage to earthly loyalty, and shall I be told that in the Churches of Christ fathers and mothers will begrudge their children to Him who is the King of kings and Lord of lords?" [1]

It cannot be repeated too often that it is only as subservient to a higher Patriotism that all earthly patriotisms tend to fall into place and usefulness. Otherwise they illustrate only too readily the justice of Ruskin's warning: "Every faculty of man's soul, and every instinct of it

[1] Quoted by Dr Ogilvie in 'The Apostles of India.'

by which he is meant to live, is exposed to its own special form of corruption. And the more beautiful they are, the more fearful is the death which is attached as a penalty to their degradation." Earthly patriotism, if it is to avail for the good of the human race, must learn to say with the Roman centurion, "I also am under authority." But so speaking and so yielding submission, it will be caught up to higher service and clothed with more tender beauty. Love of country and love of God will dwell together in unity. Love of God will prompt to love of country; and love of country will pay homage to love of God. Whether as citizens of the Heavenly Kingdom or as citizens of an earthly, Christian men will embody their patriotism (to use the phrase for the last time) in "the vividness of a thought, the ardour of a passion, the energy of an action." While the expression in Christian language of the final goal of history combines into one radiant forecast the ambitions of those who love their Saviour, and the ambitions of those who love their country—

> There were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

INDEX.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS.